

H. E. Garrison, North Charlotte.
William C. Graham, Tabor.
John L. Miller, Concord.
Lula E. Parker, West Raleigh.
Norman O. Smoak, Wilkesboro.
D. P. Stowe, Belmont.
Sallie F. Troy, Bolton.
J. B. Underwood, Fayetteville.
George R. Upchurch, Norwood.
Olive B. Webster, Siler City.

NORTH DAKOTA.

O. F. Leedy, Goodrich.
J. N. McGogy, Ashley.
Margaret Reese, Max.

OKLAHOMA.

Ada L. Andrews, Poteau.
Cora S. Brown, Waukomis.
Loddie W. Brodie, Skiatook.
John A. Burch, Paden.
Dora V. Burton, Stroud.
Dorothy A. Collen, Avant.
Laurence L. Dunlap, New Wilson.
Joseph H. English, Walter.
W. M. Erwin, Pauls Valley.
T. E. Futrell, Porum.
William A. Jenkins, Beggs.
Herbert E. Malone, Dewar.
R. R. Morris, Coweta.
Frank Olsmith, Guthrie.
John C. Puryear, Wetumka.
Mary Alleen Quarles, Fairfax.
John E. Reasonover, Bixby.
James N. Ross, Talihina.
Luther B. Smith, Marietta.
H. F. Turner, Vian.
David W. Wells, Mountain View.
W. B. Williamson, Okmulgee.

OREGON.

John J. Cooke, Oregon City.
John H. Brooks, Silverton.
Andrew J. Flynn, Sheridan.
Kenneth B. Grimm, Hubbard.
William D. Hardesty, Freewater.
Orrin A. Kirby, Myrtle Creek.
John M. Parry, Moro.
Ross A. Pickering, Pilot Rock.
T. A. Reavis, Hood River.
David S. Young, Dufur.

PORTO RICO.

Mario S. Belaval, Ponce.
Eugenio C. Manautou, Caguas.
Jose Mayol Alcover, Utuado.
Juan Padovani, Guayama.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Levi S. Bowers, Prosperity.
W. S. Hite, Batesburg.
George I. Hutchinson, Summerville.
James C. Jennings, Pickens.
Joseph P. Ouzts, Edgefield.
Malcolm J. Stanley, Hampton.
Andrew A. Stuart, McCormick.

TEXAS.

Frank P. Bell, Richmond.
P. D. Chapman, Henderson.
J. D. Cooper, Brookshire.
J. J. Crockett, Chapel Hill.
Harvey C. Dorton, Freeport.
Lula Ezell, Timpson.
J. F. Faulkner, McLean.
W. N. Fields, Ganado.
Lizzie Earle Holloway, Ferris.
Newton W. Graham, Ozona.
Mary Harrell, Waelder.
Ella D. Harris, Angleton.
Charles F. Hoff, Yorktown.
J. W. A. Jackson, Canadian.
Florence F. Kellogg, Carrizo Springs.
D. S. Lankford, Mineola.

A. L. McDonald, Rising Star.
W. H. Lankford, Sherman.
Stephen D. Ratcliff, Ratcliff.
Gustave Reininger, New Braunfels.
Hugo E. Schuchard, Menard.
Walter A. Thompson, Edinburg.
A. A. Weeks, Bellevue.
Claude Wiley, Oakwood.

UTAH.

L. M. Olson, Ephraim.

VIRGINIA.

J. S. Agnew, Burkeville.
Waverly S. Barrett, Dendron.
Lillie L. Davis, National Soldiers' Home.
John T. Dickenson, Castlewood.
Zachariah C. Gold, Basic.
John B. Hanes, Dillwyn.
Joseph W. Haydon, Irvington.
Pierce M. Kilmartin, Waverly.
John E. Lewis, Bluemont.
J. R. Perfater, Saltville.
J. B. Richardson, Marion.
John Peter Saul, Salem.
William W. Wood, Clarksville.

WASHINGTON.

R. P. Hoskyn, Oroville.
H. T. Jones, Riverside.
Elmer Thackston, Ione.

WEST VIRGINIA.

W. Jack Hunter, Berkeley Springs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, December 16, 1915.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, give us a larger, a deeper faith in Thee and our fellow men; a hope that shall lead us upward and onward to larger life and nobler living; a love so profound and far-reaching that it may go out in sympathy and good will to all mankind. The past is gone, the future is a sealed book; the present alone is ours. May we meet the duties and responsibilities of to-day with courage and fidelity and be the better prepared to meet the duties and responsibilities of to-morrow, that we may pass on our way rejoicing in life and its far-reaching purposes, leaving the results to Thee who knoweth the beginning and the end. For Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. MANN. To correct the Journal. I notice that it states in two places, where bills were called up on call of the committees and considered by unanimous consent at the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON], "no prior report having been made." They were considered by unanimous consent notwithstanding they had not been printed as reported. The Journal ought not to show that unanimous consent was given and the request made because no prior report had been made, because a prior report would not be made in any case.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the correction will be made. [There was no objection.] Without objection, the Journal as amended will be agreed to. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. GALLIVAN, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence indefinitely, on account of illness.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message, in writing, from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries.

INTERNAL REVENUE.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House joint resolution No. 59.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to consider House joint resolution No. 59.

Mr. KITCHIN. And pending that motion, I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] if there is any chance of our agreeing on a time for general debate?

Mr. MANN. This is the beginning of the session, and it is a very important proposition. We have had a great many requests on this side for time, which I think would take, reasonably granted, at least 12 hours.

Mr. KITCHIN. Does not the gentleman consider it mighty important that this resolution should pass and go to the Senate to-day?

Mr. MANN. I think it is more important it should be properly considered.

Mr. KITCHIN. I would like to say to the gentleman that we are perfectly willing, if it is satisfactory to him, to give his side 3 hours and we take an hour and 15 minutes.

Mr. MANN. I can understand why that side of the House does not want to discuss such a nefarious proposition, but this side of the House would like to discuss a lot of the items included in this law proposed to be extended that are utterly unjust. I can not consent to that arrangement for time.

Mr. KITCHIN. Question, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House joint resolution No. 59, "Extending the provisions of the act entitled 'An act to increase the internal revenue, and for other purposes,' approved October 22, 1914, to December 31, 1916," with Mr. FITZGERALD in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House joint resolution No. 59, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House joint resolution (H. J. Res. 59) extending the provisions of the act entitled "An act to increase the internal revenue, and for other purposes," approved October 22, 1914, to December 31, 1916.

Resolved, etc., That the provisions of the act entitled "An act to increase the internal revenue, and for other purposes," approved October 22, 1914 (Stat. L., vol. 38, pp. 745-764), are continued in full force and effect until and including December 31, 1916.

SEC. 2. That the appropriation for salaries and expenses of collectors of internal revenue, deputy collectors, surveyors, clerks, messengers, and janitors in internal-revenue offices for the fiscal year 1916 is made available for all expenses arising under the provisions of this joint resolution during the last half of the fiscal year 1916, including not exceeding \$6,050 for payment of necessary personal services in the office of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue in the District of Columbia.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] is recognized for one hour. [Applause.]

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a brief statement as to the necessity for this bill. When it was passed the House considered that the European war would last only, or not as long as, a year, and we therefore limited the operation of the bill to one year—that is, to December 31, 1915. But the war has continued and has no prospect of an early conclusion, and your committee thought it was necessary, and, in fact, we absolutely know it is necessary, to reenact this bill. According to the customs receipts while the Underwood law was in operation before the European war began, we lost from revenues at least \$59,000,000 in the last fiscal year. We have also lost about \$26,000,000 from the internal revenue on distilled spirits, fermented liquors, and tobacco, making at least \$85,000,000.

Now, this revenue bill produces about \$80,000,000 a year. The next half of the fiscal year 1916 it is estimated that it will collect, if extended, \$41,000,000. If not extended, there will be a deficit in the Treasury at the end of the fiscal year of \$81,525,000. It is absolutely necessary that Congress shall provide some way in which to raise that amount of revenue. Even if we extend this act, and even if we later extend the sugar clause—that is, strike out the free-list sugar clause of the Underwood tariff bill—we will then have a deficit of about \$6,000,000 a month for the remainder of the fiscal year; but if we do not extend this act and do not strike out the free-list clause in the sugar act, we will have a deficit of \$81,525,000.

We Democrats know, of course, that this bill is unpopular. We know that no tax is popular in times of peace. It is difficult to write a tax bill that will appeal to the judgment and gain the approval of any man, but the country placed this Government and its finances in the control of the Democratic Party.

The necessity exists to raise a certain amount of revenue. The deficits are there, and I believe that we would be unworthy of the record of the Democrats under this administration if we did not have the courage and the patriotism to do the unpopular thing and arrange sufficient revenues to meet the absolute necessities of the Government.

We think that it is absolutely necessary that this joint resolution should be passed to-day. Gentlemen here and at the other end of the Capitol wish to go home and have a recess by Saturday, and this resolution should be passed before the expiration of the life of the emergency tax law of October 22, 1914. It expires December 31, 1915. If we should fail to pass it now, then it would take after the holidays, I think, from two to three months to pass any bill to supply any deficits.

Mr. GARNER. And in that case there will not be any holidays.

Mr. KITCHIN. And it is probable, as my friend from Texas [Mr. GARNER] suggests, that if we do not pass it there will not be any holidays. But, as I say, it is absolutely necessary to pass it before December 31, 1915. Otherwise we would be thrown into the necessity of going to the expense, when we did pass such a bill hereafter, of completely reorganizing the whole internal-revenue force, and I do ask and appeal to every Democrat here to vote for this joint resolution, because it is absolutely necessary, unpopular as it may be.

I desire now to reserve the balance of my time, and I shall discuss the matter at length in closing the debate. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman reserve his time?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] said that they, the Democrats, were now moved to do the unpopular but patriotic thing in passing this law. They are forced to pass this law in order to save the Treasury of the United States from bankruptcy. [Applause on the Republican side.]

My Democratic friends, you and I disagree politically; in no other way. Under the Underwood tariff law the free-sugar clause, so called, places sugar on the free list on the 1st day of May next. Under that law sugar has yielded to this Government in customs receipts for nine months of this calendar year \$45,000,000, and if for the remaining three months sugar yields a proportionate amount of revenue, the customs receipts on sugar this year will amount to \$60,000,000. The total customs receipts for the calendar year 1915 will yield a fraction less than \$200,000,000. Sixty million dollars, as I have said, from imported sugar. You are compelled, in order to save your Treasury from a deficit, to extend this law and to repeal the free-sugar clause in the Underwood Tariff Act, not because you want to, but because you are obliged to.

During the last seven months prior to the war in Europe, at which time the Underwood Tariff Act was in effect, imports which were made were more than \$100,000,000 greater than in any corresponding month in any previous year in all our history, and customs receipts during that period averaged about \$22,200,000 a month, or an average of about \$5,000,000 per month less than was collected under the Payne Tariff Act. For the last eight months of this calendar year, to the 1st day of November, the foreign imports, notwithstanding the war in Europe, exceeded the imports for the same period under the Payne tariff law in 1913 by \$56,000,000, and the customs receipts were \$77,000,000 less.

It is not due to the war in Europe that the condition of the Treasury of the United States to-day is chaotic. It is due to your tariff law. [Applause on the Republican side.] If you were to have extended the Republican tariff laws upon the statute books when you came into power, you would collect more money than the Treasury of the United States under judicious management would have used during this administration. I say, my friends, that notwithstanding the fact that we have had war in Europe all those months since the 3d day of August, 1914, the revenues of this Government, based upon the ad valorem rates in the Payne tariff law, would have yielded to this country sufficient revenues to pay the running expenses of this Government. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Your Treasury to-day is in a chaotic condition. Your Treasurer has changed the manner of bookkeeping in the United States Treasury; and if there were a national bank within the limits of the United States to-day that would adopt the manner of bookkeeping such as has been adopted in the Treasury of the United States, the bank examiner, under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, would have every man connected

with that bank in jail within 24 hours. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] And justly so. To carry as a net balance in the Treasury of the United States the money that is there to redeem outstanding warrants, and to show it as a net balance, is a kind of bookkeeping that I was never taught to be correct, as little as I have been taught on book-keeping.

My friends, I will not occupy a great length of time, for the reason that there are many other men on this side of the House who wish to discuss this question. But first let me say that the Democratic administration is boasting to-day of excessive exports, a great balance of trade, such as this country never before has shown. My friends, I have selected from the exports, as furnished by the Government in the summary, a list of articles that have been sent abroad because of this war in foreign countries, and for a period of nine months of this year there has been an increased exportation of \$765,000,000 of war material and a falling off of \$60,000,000 in that time of ordinary exports. And yet you boast of that ungodly gain made, my friends, by the people of this country in producing something to place in the hands of one man in Europe to take the life of another. It is a deplorable profit, a deplorable balance of trade, and yet some boast of our grand balance of trade.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] desire to use some time?

Mr. KITCHIN. No. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FITZGERALD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration House joint resolution 59, extending the provisions of the war-revenue act, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House joint resolution 59; and, pending that motion, I move that general debate close in two hours and a half; and on that I demand the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House joint resolution 59, and pending that he moves that general debate be limited to two hours and a half, and on that he demands the previous question.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MANN) there were—ayes 164, noes 173.

Mr. KITCHIN. I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 208, nays 191, answered "present" 3, not voting 30, as follows:

YEAS—208.

Abercrombie	Coady	Garner	Kitchin
Adamson	Collier	Garrett	Konop
Aiken	Connelly	Glass	Lazaro
Alexander	Conry	Godwin, N. C.	Lee
Allen	Cox	Goodwin, Ark.	Leshner
Almon	Crisp	Gordon	Lever
Ashbrook	Crosser	Gray, Ind.	Lewis
Aswell	Cullop	Gregg	Liebel
Ayres	Dale, N. Y.	Griffin	Linthicum
Bailey	Davis, Tex.	Hamill	Littlepage
Barkley	Decker	Hardy	Lloyd
Barnhart	Dent	Harrison	Lobeck
Beakes	Dewalt	Hart	London
Bell	Dickinson	Hastings	McAndrews
Black	Dies	Hay	McClintic
Blackmon	Dill	Hayden	McDermott
Borland	Dixon	Hefflin	McGillicuddy
Brown, W. Va.	Dooling	Helm	McLemore
Bruckner	Doolittle	Helvering	Mays
Brumbaugh	Doremus	Henry	Montague
Buchanan, Ill.	Doughton	Hensley	Moon
Buchanan, Tex.	Driscoll	Holland	Morgan, La.
Burgess	Dupré	Hood	Morrison
Burke	Eagan	Houston	Moss, Ind.
Burnett	Eagle	Howard	Murray
Byrnes, S. C.	Edwards	Huddleston	Neely
Byrns, Tenn.	Estopinal	Hughes	Nicholls, S. C.
Candler, Miss.	Evans	Hulbert	Oglesby
Cantrill	Farley	Hull, Tenn.	Oldfield
Caraway	Ferris	Humphreys, Miss.	Oliver
Carew	Finley	Igoe	Olney
Carlin	Fitzgerald	Jacoway	O'Shaunessy
Carter, Okla.	Flood	Johnson, Ky.	Overmyer
Casey	Flynn	Jones	Page, N. C.
Church	Foster	Kettner	Park
Clark, Fla.	Gandy	Key, Ohio	Patten
Cline	Gard	Kincheloe	Pou

Price	Sears	Steele, Pa.	Tillman
Quinn	Shackelford	Stephens, Miss.	Tribble
Ragsdale	Shallenberger	Stephens, Nebr.	Van Dyke
Rainey	Sherley	Stephens, Tex.	Vinson
Raker	Sherwood	Stone	Walker
Randall	Shouse	Stout	Watkins
Rauch	Sims	Summers	Watson, Va.
Rayburn	Slisson	Taggart	Webb
Rellly	Slayden	Tague	Whaley
Rouse	Small	Talbott	Williams, W. E.
Rubey	Smith, Tex.	Tavener	Wilson, Fla.
Rucker	Sparkman	Taylor, Ark.	Wilson, La.
Russell, Mo.	Stegall	Taylor, Colo.	Wingo
Sabath	Stedman	Thomas	Wise
Saunders	Steele, Iowa	Thompson	Young, Tex.

NAYS—191.

Anderson	Frear	Kreider	Reavis
Anthony	Freeman	Lafan	Ricketts
Bacharach	Fuller	La Follette	Roberts, Nev.
Beales	Gardner	Lehlbach	Rodenberg
Britt	Garland	Lenroot	Rogers
Britten	Gillett	Lindbergh	Rowe
Browne, Wis.	Glynn	Longworth	Russell, Ohio
Browning	Good	Loud	Schall
Butler	Gould	McArthur	Scott, Mich.
Callaway	Graham	McCracken	Sells
Campbell	Gray, N. J.	McCulloch	Siegel
Cannon	Green, Iowa	McFadden	Sinnott
Capstick	Greene, Mass.	McKenzie	Slomp
Carter, Mass.	Greene, Vt.	McKinley	Sloan
Cary	Griest	McLaughlin	Smith, Idaho
Chandler, N. Y.	Guernsey	Madden	Smith, Mich.
Charles	Hadley	Magee	Smith, Minn.
Chipfield	Hamilton, Mich.	Mann	Snell
Coleman	Haskell	Mapes	Snyder
Cooper, Ohio	Haugen	Martin	Stafford
Cooper, W. Va.	Hawley	Matthews	Steenerson
Cooper, Wis.	Hayes	Meeker	Stephens, Cal.
Copley	Heaton	Miller, Del.	Sterling
Costello	Helgesen	Miller, Pa.	Stiness
Crago	Hernandez	Mondell	Sullivan
Cramton	Bill	Mooney	Sutherland
Curry	Hilliard	Moore, Pa.	Sweet
Dale, Vt.	Hinds	Moore, Ind.	Swift
Dallinger	Hollingsworth	Morgan, Okla.	Temple
Danforth	Hopwood	Morin	Tilson
Darrow	Howell	Moss, W. Va.	Timberlake
Davis, Minn.	Hull, Iowa	Mott	Tinkham
Dempsey	Humphrey, Wash.	Mudd	Towner
Dillon	Husted	Nelson	Treadway
Dowell	Hutchinson	Nichols, Mich.	Vare
Drukker	James	Nolan	Volstead
Dunn	Johnson, S. Dak.	North	Walsh
Dyer	Johnson, Wash.	Norton	Ward
Edmonds	Kahn	Oakey	Watson
Ellsworth	Kearns	Paige, Mass.	Watson, Pa.
Elston	Keating	Parker, N. J.	Wheeler
Emerson	Keister	Parker, N. Y.	Williams, T. S.
Esch	Kelley	Peters	Williams, Ohio
Fairchild	Kennedy, Iowa	Platt	Wilson, Ill.
Farr	Kennedy, R. I.	Porter	Wood, Ind.
Focht	Kiess, Pa.	Powers	Woods, Iowa
Fordney	King	Pratt	Young, N. Dak.
Foss	Kinkaid	Ramseyer	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3.

Austin	Roberts, Mass.	Switzer
--------	----------------	---------

NOT VOTING—30.

Adair	Fields	Lieb	Rowland
Barchfeld	Gallagher	Loft	Sanford
Bennet	Gallivan	McKellar	Scott, Pa.
Booher	Gray, Ala.	Maher	Scully
Caldwell	Hamilton, N. Y.	Miller, Minn.	Smith, N. Y.
Davenport	Hamlin	Padgett	Winslow
Denison	Kent	Phelan	
Fess	Langley	Riordan	

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. McKellar with Mr. Austin.

Mr. Booher with Mr. Fess.

Mr. Davenport with Mr. Miller of Minnesota.

Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Hamilton of New York.

Mr. Fields with Mr. Langley.

Mr. Hamlin with Mr. Sanford.

Mr. Phelan with Mr. Scott of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Gallivan with Mr. Barchfeld.

Mr. Scully with Mr. Rowland.

Mr. Padgett with Mr. Roberts of Massachusetts.

Mr. Riordan with Mr. Bennet.

Mr. Adair with Mr. Winslow.

Mr. Lieb with Mr. Switzer.

Mr. Austin. Mr. Speaker, I desire to withdraw my vote and to answer "present." I am paired with my colleague, Mr. McKellar.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The previous question is ordered, and the question is on limiting debate to two hours and a half.

Mr. MANN. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 212, nays 191, answered "present" 3, not voting 26, as follows:

YEAS—212.

Abercrombie	Dickinson	Humphreys, Miss.	Reilly
Adamson	Dies	Igoe	Riordan
Aiken	Dill	Jacoway	Rouse
Alexander	Dixon	Johnson, Ky.	Rubey
Allen	Doelling	Jones	Rucker
Almon	Doolittle	Kettner	Russell, Mo.
Ashbrook	Doremus	Key, Ohio	Sabath
Aswell	Doughton	Kincheloe	Saunders
Ayres	Driscoll	Kitchin	Sears
Bailey	Dupré	Konop	Shackleford
Barkley	Eagan	Lazaro	Shallenberger
Barnhart	Eagle	Lee	Sherley
Beakes	Edwards	Leshner	Sherwood
Bell	Estopinal	Lever	Shouse
Black	Evans	Lewis	Sims
Blackmon	Farley	Liebel	Sisson
Booher	Ferris	Linthicum	Slayden
Borland	Finley	Littlepage	Small
Brown, W. Va.	Fitzgerald	Lloyd	Smith, Tex.
Bruckner	Flood	Lobeck	Sparkman
Brumbaugh	Flynn	London	Stegall
Buchanan, Ill.	Foster	McAndrews	Stedman
Buchanan, Tex.	Gandy	McClintic	Steele, Iowa
Burgess	Gard	McDermott	Steele, Pa.
Burke	Garner	McGillcuddy	Stephens, Miss.
Burnett	Garrett	McLemore	Stephens, Nebr.
Byrnes, S. C.	Glass	Mays	Stephens, Tex.
Byrns, Tenn.	Goodwin, N. C.	Montague	Stone
Caldwell	Goodwin, Ark.	Moon	Stout
Candler, Miss.	Gordon	Morgan, La.	Summers
Cantrill	Gray, Ind.	Morrison	Taggart
Caraway	Gregg	Moss, Ind.	Tague
Carew	Griffin	Murray	Talbot
Carlin	Hamill	Neely	Tavener
Carter, Okla.	Hardy	Nicholls, S. C.	Taylor, Ark.
Casey	Harrison	Oglesby	Taylor, Colo.
Church	Hart	Oldfield	Thomas
Clark, Fla.	Hastings	Oliver	Thompson
Cline	Hay	Olney	Tillman
Coady	Hayden	O'Shaunessy	Tribble
Collier	Heflin	Overmyer	Van Dyke
Connelly	Helm	Page, N. C.	Vinson
Conry	Helvering	Park	Walker
Cox	Henry	Patten	Watkins
Crisp	Hensley	Pou	Watson, Va.
Crosser	Holland	Price	Webb
Cullop	Hood	Quin	Whaley
Dale, N. Y.	Houston	Ragsdale	Williams, W. E.
Davenport	Howard	Rainey	Wilson, Fla.
Davis, Tex.	Huddleston	Raker	Wilson, La.
Decker	Hughes	Randall	Wingo
Dent	Hulbert	Rauch	Wise
Dewalt	Hull, Tenn.	Rayburn	Young, Tex.

NAYS—191.

Anderson	Foss	Kreider	Reavis
Anthony	Frear	Lefean	Ricketts
Bacharach	Freeman	Le Follette	Roberts, Nev.
Beales	Fuller	Lehlbach	Rodenberg
Britt	Gardner	Lenroot	Rogers
Britten	Gillett	Lindbergh	Rowe
Browne, Wis.	Glynn	Longworth	Russell, Ohio
Browning	Good	Loud	Schall
Butler	Gould	McArthur	Scott, Mich.
Callaway	Graham	McCracken	Sells
Campbell	Gray, N. J.	McCulloch	Siegel
Cannon	Green, Iowa	McFadden	Sinnott
Capstick	Greene, Mass.	McKenzie	Simp
Carter, Mass.	Greene, Vt.	McKinley	Sloan
Cary	Griest	McLaughlin	Smith, Idaho
Chandler, N. Y.	Guernsey	Madden	Smith, Mich.
Charles	Hadley	Magee	Smith, Minn.
Chapfield	Hamilton, Mich.	Mann	Snell
Coleman	Haskell	Mapes	Snyder
Cooper, Ohio	Haugen	Martin	Stafford
Cooper, W. Va.	Hayley	Matthews	Steenerson
Cooper, Wis.	Hayes	Meeker	Stephens, Cal.
Copley	Hendon	Miller, Del.	Sterling
Costello	Helgesen	Miller, Minn.	Stiness
Crago	Hernandez	Miller, Pa.	Sulloway
Cramton	Hill	Mondell	Sutherland
Curry	Hilliard	Mooney	Sweet
Dale, Vt.	Hinds	Moore, Pa.	Swift
Dallinger	Hollingsworth	Moore, Ind.	Temple
Danforth	Hopwood	Morgan, Okla.	Tilson
Darrow	Howell	Morin	Timberlake
Davis, Minn.	Hull, Iowa	Moss, W. Va.	Tinkham
Dempsy	Humphrey, Wash.	Mott	Towner
Denison	Husted	Mudd	Treadway
Dillon	Hutchinson	Nelson	Vare
Dowell	James	Nichols, Mich.	Volstead
Drukker	Johnson, S. Dak.	Nolan	Walsh
Dunn	Johnson, Wash.	North	Ward
Dyer	Kahn	Norton	Wason
Edmonds	Kearns	Oakey	Watson, Pa.
Ellsworth	Keating	Paige, Mass.	Wheeler
Elston	Keister	Parker, N. J.	Williams, T. S.
Emerson	Kelley	Parker, N. Y.	Williams, Ohio
Esch	Kennedy, Iowa	Peters	Wilson, Ill.
Fairchild	Kennedy, R. I.	Platt	Wood, Ind.
Farr	Kiess, Pa.	Powers	Woods, Iowa
Focht	King	Pratt	Young, N. Dak.
Fordney	Kinkaid	Ramseyer	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3.

Austin	Roberts, Mass.	Switzer
--------	----------------	---------

NOT VOTING—26.

Adair	Garland	Loft	Sanford
Barchfeld	Gray, Ala.	McKellar	Scott, Pa.
Bennet	Hamilton, N. Y.	Maher	Scully
Fess	Hamlin	Padgett	Smith, N. Y.
Fields	Kent	Phelan	Winslow
Gallagher	Langley	Porter	
Gallivan	Lieb	Rowland	

So the motion was agreed to.

The following additional pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. MAHER with Mr. FESS.

Mr. LOFT with Mr. BENNET.

Mr. SMITH of New York with Mr. PORTER.

The SPEAKER. On this question there are 212 yeas and 191 nays. The motion is agreed to.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House joint resolution 59; and, pending that, I ask unanimous consent that I control an hour and a quarter of the time and the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. FORDNEY, control an hour and a quarter.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that he control one half of the time and the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. FORDNEY, the other half. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from North Carolina to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. FITZGERALD in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House joint resolution 59, extending the provisions of the act entitled "An act to increase the internal revenue, and for other purposes," approved October 22, 1914, to December 31, 1916, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the provisions of the act entitled "An act to increase the internal revenue, and for other purposes," approved October 22, 1914 (Stat. L., vol. 38, pp. 745-764, inclusive), are continued in full force and effect until and including December 31, 1916.

Sec. 2. That the appropriation for salaries and expenses of collectors of internal revenue, deputy collectors, surveyors, clerks, messengers, and janitors in internal-revenue offices for the fiscal year 1916 is made available for all expenses arising under the provisions of this joint resolution during the last half of the fiscal year 1916, including not exceeding \$6,050 for payment of necessary personal services in the office of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue in the District of Columbia.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL].

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the necessities, as well as the merits of the pending resolution, were fully discussed and considered by this House in September of last year. The conditions imperatively necessitating the continuance of the present emergency tax law are even more apparent now than they were then. I had no intention of consuming any of the time, therefore, in the further discussion of this measure, and except for the strange and unexpected and unfair attitude assumed by gentlemen on the other side I should have remained silent.

We are confronted by a Republican minority which seems to be disappointed, desperate, and mad. They seem to be mad because their wonderful prophecies of dire calamity that would sweep over this country under a Democratic administration and a Democratic tariff law have been blown to atoms and have proven false in every particular. They appear to be desperate because under this administration and under the present tariff law we did not have a recurrence of those awful calamitous conditions that visited this country under the panic of 1907, when the Dingley high-protective tariff law was in operation.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Amen. [Applause.]

Mr. HULL of Tennessee. And of similar and even worse conditions that came upon this country in the early nineties, when the McKinley high-protective tariff law was in operation, and of still worse conditions which visited this country in 1873, when the Morrill high-protective tariff law was in operation, which was supposed and known to be a high-protective tariff law.

What is our situation, Mr. Chairman? I had assumed that in this great body of intelligent and supposedly patriotic gentlemen a mere reading of the committee's report recommending the passage of the pending resolution would have satisfied any man who would be inclined to respond to the dictates of public duty and public patriotism. But not so. We are at once confronted

by gentlemen on the other side in the most narrow, vindictive, and bigoted spirit of partisanship, attempting at this critical time in the affairs of the country and the affairs of the world to haggle over the precise method, the particular details, by which Congress, in response to the request of the President and the Treasury Department, shall meet a most serious emergency due to war conditions. Why, Mr. Chairman, there is not a country on this planet to-day that has not had this precise question, this precise situation, as to emergency taxes, to deal with during the past few months. I here and now challenge any gentleman on the other side to name a single country that has not had this precise emergency revenue situation to deal with during the past few months. And yet gentlemen on the other side, in feigned astonishment and for the sole purpose of playing politics, rise here and undertake to impede the passage of this measure, which every citizen in this country at all intelligent knows is absolutely urgent and necessary. Canada over here lost 28 per cent of her customs revenues during the first few months of the war and levied a stamp tax on everything that could be found to meet the deficiency. Japan lost \$41,000,000 of her customs revenue during the first four months, and has been busy, as we have, undertaking to replenish the deficiency.

Every South American Republic lost on an average 50 per cent of its imports during the first few months of the war, and they were obliged to issue bonds, to borrow money, to declare a general state of moratorium, and still, in the face of these facts and in the face of the further facts that Spain, the Scandinavian countries, Switzerland, Holland, and every other peace country on earth has had to deal with this emergency treasury situation, we are not permitted, without the injection of narrow, hide-bound partisanship, to pass a little tax resolution, the necessity for which is apparent to everyone. Over in the Canadian Parliament, in the South American legislative bodies, and in parliaments of Europe, where these emergency revenue matters have arisen during the war, the members, without respect to partisanship, but in the spirit of the highest patriotism, have risen as one man and voted through such legislation as was necessary to tide over the situation. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I must confess, Mr. Chairman, that this is a new kind of patriotism which some of our friends on the other side are undertaking to bring into notice. It seems to be a political patriotism, a patriotism that places politics far above a high public duty and love of country. It would appear to be a kind of hyphenated patriotism. [Laughter and applause on Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY], to my deep regret and disappointment, undertook, in a spirit as venomous and vicious as it was ignorant, to criticize the Treasury Department for having corrected, in accordance with a piece of Republican legislation, the daily publication showing the exact and accurate condition of the Treasury. He says that the Treasury Department would have been imprisoned if they had been in the same category as national banks for having made these changes, which every expert accountant in the United States will say are accurate and true.

In 1890, under the administration of President Harrison, there was a deficit confronting the administration. Hon. John Sherman drew and secured the passage of a measure under the terms of which money deposited in the National Treasury to redeem national-bank notes should go into the general fund under the head of miscellaneous, and that the notes directed to be retired should be classed as a part of the public debt. Complying with the exact letter of that law, one part of the change, which the gentleman from Michigan so viciously condemned, was made to conform to it. Again, the gentleman from Michigan seems to set the pace of those on his side of the House, which is, on every occasion during the coming session and the coming year, to undertake to hinder and impede the efforts of the majority to deal with the important legislative questions of the country. So far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, I want to notify the gentleman from Michigan now that I do not on my part as one Democrat among several millions intend to assume the defensive, in view of the wonderful record of honesty in the administration of every department of this Government, with its absolute freedom from scandal in every respect, with a record of constructive achievement that challenges the comparison of any former administration; and I want to say to the gentleman that during this session and during next year, so far as I am concerned, I propose to go out with other Democrats in an aggressive manner, without explanation or apology, standing flat-footed upon this record of honesty and constructive ability on the part of the present administration, and to meet them in the open field of battle. I do not propose to assume the defensive, to be dodging, to be evading, to be halting, or hesitating whenever some gentleman, purely for

partisan purposes, undertakes to impede legislation or to thwart the purposes of the majority. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, I wish to show, as I conceive it, the utter inconsistency and utter lack of patriotism on the other side. When the Spanish-American War came on and they were in the majority, they made no suggestion or offer to attempt a general overhauling of the tariff law, although the Dingley tariff of that year was yielding only \$147,000,000, as against \$176,000,000 for the previous year under the Wilson bill. No; their attention was not on that subject at that time, as it seems to be now. The first thing they did was to issue \$190,000,000 of bonds and throw their proceeds into the National Treasury. They had a general balance of \$118,000,000 in the Treasury. The next thing they did was to call upon their colleagues in Congress to aid in passing a comprehensive emergency tax law, from which the present law was identically taken. They did that, and within 12 months' time, although the danger then was not so great as the danger and the necessity is now, they thus threw into the National Treasury more than \$300,000,000. But on this present occasion, when they are called upon in a spirit of nonpartisanship and of earnest patriotism to perform a duty that is as plain as it is urgent, we are confronted only by an exhibition of narrow, blind, stand-pat partisanship. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution and bills of the following titles:

H. J. Res. 61. Joint resolution authorizing payment of the salaries of officers and employees of Congress for December, 1915;

H. R. 663. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Citizens' Bridge Co. to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Burlington Iowa; and

H. R. 3638. An act to extend the time for constructing a bridge across the St. Francis River at or near St. Francis, Ark.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

S. J. Res. 38. Joint resolution to transfer the Government exhibit from the Panama-Pacific International Exposition to the Panama-California Exposition, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. JONES and Mr. LANE members of the joint committee on the part of the Senate as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889, as amended by the act of March 2, 1895, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments," for the disposition of useless papers in the Treasury Department.

INTERNAL REVENUE.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, when a great political party introduces a measure imposing \$80,000,000 in taxes and presents it for immediate passage without affording any opportunity for correcting its conceded injustice and imperfections, it becomes the duty of the leaders of that party to frankly confess that an emergency exists which brooks no delay and to frankly and clearly set forth the condition of the national finances. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN], the distinguished leader of the majority, has accepted this duty and has performed it on his part; but the administration, whose announcements have been heralded abroad by the press, not only has refused to admit the existence of the emergency but has carefully concealed the condition of the Treasury, and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL], who has just spoken, has followed the administration regardless of where it led him.

On the second day of this session the President of the United States addressed Congress on the condition of the state of the Union in general, and, among other things, on the condition and state of the Treasury. It had been announced beforehand that he would recommend enlargements of the Army and Navy, which would enormously increase our annual expenditures. These expenditures had in the last fiscal year heavily exceeded the receipts, and the balance in the Treasury continued to shrink as each day went by. I hoped, therefore, that when the President called upon Congress to furnish additional revenue that a full

and accurate statement of the condition of the Treasury and of the demands which were likely to be made upon it would be set forth in his message. I knew, of course, that in these seasons of shrinkage in revenue and increase of deficits, the inevitable attributes of a Democratic administration, such a statement would be somewhat humiliating and anything but pleasant reading for the American people. [Applause on the Republican side.] It necessarily involved a confession of failure on the part of the Democratic Party to properly manage the finances of the country, but unless it was made the country would not understand how nearly exhausted the Treasury was and what it would need in the future. The administration not only owed such a statement to this House for the proper consideration of this bill, but it owed it to the Nation, and probably the mass of the people thought they received it, but they did not. The fatal faculty of our Democratic friends for mixing their imagination with their mathematics was everywhere manifest [laughter], and the statement which was furnished was misleading and incorrect to an astonishing degree.

Let me emphasize at this point that I am not holding the President responsible for the figures he gave in his message, which, of course, were furnished under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury. I would not want to make that kind of a charge against the Chief Executive. It is too serious. Besides it was unnecessary for him to make computations when he had a calculator in his family; and what reason, indeed, could be given why he should not rely on the Secretary of the Treasury for any figures that he should give out? If, then, we wish to obtain an explanation of the surprising figures found in the message, we must turn to the source of his information.

For myself, I wished to learn particularly how and where the President had discovered that on June 30 last there was a balance in the Treasury of \$104,170,105.78. On that date I had received a statement, issued by the Treasury Department, stating that the balance was \$82,025,716.03. This difference of \$22,000,000, while it may seem small in comparison with some other changes, I thought was worth looking after in interest of the public. At this point I recalled that the Secretary of the Treasury had recently given the press a statement in which the conditions of the Treasury was set forth in glowing colors. You may remember that this statement was published in the newspapers, and that it not only represented that there was now a large balance on hand, but also that there would be the comfortable surplus of \$76,000,000 in the Treasury at the end of the fiscal year of 1916, if the present taxes were continued. As this statement appears to be the one upon which the President based the figures used in his message, and is repeated in the report of the Secretary of the Treasury it becomes necessary to analyze it.

It is not often that one can introduce a flavor of romance into cold figures, but Mr. McAdoo has done it. [Laughter.] The statement of the condition of our national finances which he gave to the press is one of the most interesting of the recent works of fiction, although probably not one of the "best sellers." [Laughter.] After examining it, I was irresistibly reminded of one of the famous characters in Dickens's works—Mr. Micawber, in the novel "David Copperfield." Mr. Micawber was the originator of the celebrated maxim—"Annual income £20, annual expenses £19 6s.; result, happiness; annual income £20, annual expenses £20 6s.; result, misery"—an expression peculiarly adapted to the condition of the National Treasury under the present Democratic régime. But Mr. Micawber was an optimist, and, like the Secretary of the Treasury, present deficits did not occupy his mind so much as visions of a large surplus in the future. Dickens's famous character has often been considered an exaggeration, but Mr. Micawber's peculiar characteristics are portrayed in this statement of the Secretary of the Treasury. Let us see what the real facts are with reference to the condition of the Treasury, and compare them with the statement of Mr. McAdoo and the outline presented by the President's message.

On June 1 of last year the balance in the Treasury was less than \$15,000,000, according to the daily statement. At that time nearly \$30,000,000 of the resources of the Treasury consisted of subsidiary silver and other minor coins. It was obvious that if the Government was called upon to meet its demand obligations it would have to dip into this fund of nickels, dimes, quarters, and so forth, and the balance in the Treasury began to look like "thirty cents," indeed. [Laughter.]

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Iowa yield to his colleague?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will.

Mr. TOWNER. I notice that the President said in his address that this is an "available balance." Will the gentleman be

kind enough to give the House what is meant by "available balance" in the Treasury?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I can not state what is meant by an "available balance" in the Treasury as understood by the President, but I will give the House my opinion of what an available balance is later on.

About this time the Treasury, through the collectors of internal revenue, began to send out frantic calls for help, requesting everyone to send in their income tax as soon as possible, and the balance began to rise. On the last day of June \$44,000,000 was paid in and it reached \$82,000,000, including silver bullion, subsidiary silver, minor coins, and so forth, and everything else that could then be thought of.

Do you ask how this \$82,000,000 could be changed to \$104,000,000? Of course the change should not surprise you, as changes are always in order with this administration. The message that contained these interesting figures announced a very important change of policy with reference to the Army and Navy which would affect the Treasury. Prior to this time the form of the daily statement had been changed and the summary of the receipts and disbursements for the year given in the daily statement of June 30 last is different from that given by the Secretary in his report recently received by Congress. A still more surprising change in the Treasury accounts will be found later. Everyone has heard of the postmaster who said that the administration could not change quicker than he could, but he was referring to a different administration—he had never held office under Mr. Wilson. If he tried to keep up with this administration, he would find himself hopelessly distanced on the first quarter of the track.

Evidently this balance of \$82,000,000 in the Treasury on June 30 as then made up did not seem large enough to Mr. McAdoo [laughter], as he added to it over \$19,000,000 from the national bank note redemption fund and over \$2,000,000 cash deposits that he said were included in the revised details, although not received by the Treasury until after that date. [Laughter.] In this way he succeeded in bringing the balance up to a little over \$104,000,000, as before stated. His excuse for including the amount due of the bank note redemption fund in the assets is that it was made by law a part of the public debt and was included therein; but it was a current liability, changing from day to day, payable on demand, which could not properly be part of a working balance. As to the cash deposits, as a matter of course they had never been counted except on the day they were received. An interesting fact in relation to this two million and odd dollars of cash deposits which the Secretary counts as of June 30, although not received until July 1, is that the balance in the Treasury on July 1 dropped to \$76,157,831.33, including the selfsame cash deposits which Mr. McAdoo now counts in with those of the day before. Apparently the Treasury officials had been doing some "window dressing" by withholding large payments until after the fiscal year. This would not matter so much if Mr. McAdoo had not taken this same balance of June 30, which he had raised \$22,000,000, and in his press statement made the amount of the balance the same for July 1 as for June 30, namely, \$104,170,105.78, when the daily statement for July 1 showed that there was in fact only a little over \$76,000,000 on that day. Even if we include the amount of the redemption fund for July 1, which was \$19,484,788, Mr. McAdoo's press statement would be over \$8,000,000 in error for July 1. These changes aptly exemplify Mr. McAdoo's financial genius. We have had some great Secretaries of the Treasury, but never before one who could succeed in having the same deposit credited on two different days or who could change a liability into an asset.

However remarkable the statement prepared by Mr. McAdoo and used by the President may seem, it is modest compared to some of the figures created by the Secretary.

After June 1 for the next three months the balance shrunk over \$35,000,000, or nearly \$12,000,000 per month. The excess of disbursements was larger than for the same months of 1914, and at the same rate for three months more would have found the Treasury practically empty. The balance in the Treasury as found in the daily statement of September 30 last was \$40,893,894.97. The situation was somewhat alarming, but Mr. McAdoo promptly arose to the occasion. In fact, he took a Zeppelin excursion into the clouds and marked the balance up overnight to \$128,063,545.23. Webster said Hamilton smote the rock of the public resources and abundant streams of revenue gushed forth, but Hamilton never achieved such a stroke as this. [Applause on the Republican side.] With such a Secretary it is evident that our Treasury never can become bankrupt, no matter how much the disbursements may exceed the receipts. But do you ask how the Secretary arrived at these figures? Easy enough. He not only put in the amount of the redemption

fund before referred to, but included \$61,089,225.97 which had been placed to the credit of disbursing officers with which to meet various debts of the Government. It was very simple, but somehow no one had ever thought of it before, and consequently disbursing officers' balances after being taken out of the Treasury were not counted as if they were still in it.

What I have said does not present a complete view of the statement given to the press by the Secretary of the Treasury. In it he hopefully predicted that the disbursements for the ensuing fiscal year would be less than for the previous year. At the outset I had a distinct reluctance to accept his prophecies, remembering his predictions for the year before, and that when June 1 came the disbursements had exceeded the receipts by \$64,165,416.78, according to the daily statement to which I always adhere. These figures, of course, have been changed also and are now given differently in the report of the Secretary and in the President's message. The excess of disbursements over receipts as given in the Secretary's report is \$57,442,509.75. I pass this over, as one who is reviewing the changes in the reports can hardly afford to pay attention to little discrepancies of six or seven millions.

I have not time to take up in detail the estimates made for the fiscal year of 1916, but why should the Secretary of the Treasury estimate the disbursements for 1916 at \$7,000,000 less for this fiscal year than for 1915? Instead of being less, it is extremely likely that they will need many millions more, as it will take at least \$10,000,000 to make up the deficiency in the Post Office revenues alone. According to the Secretary's own estimates, the disbursements will exceed the receipts by \$27,000,000, even if the war tax and sugar duties are continued. How serious the situation is can best be understood by considering the condition of the Treasury for the last month, in which there were many days when, if the amount of subsidiary silver coin, minor coin, silver bullion, bank-note redemption fund, and disbursing officers' credits were deducted, the balance would actually be on the wrong side. The President told us quite properly that there should be a working balance of \$50,000,000 in the Treasury. This bill will not satisfy the needs of the Treasury. There will be no such working balance in the Treasury at the end of the fiscal year unless additional taxes are laid above those provided by the bill and now in force. The working balance and the McAdoo balance are two very different things.

When we consider the necessities of the Treasury for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, we are informed by Mr. FITZGERALD, the very able chairman of the Appropriations Committee, that at least \$137,000,000 of additional revenue will be required for the increase asked for by the War and Navy Departments. Then there are other large items which must be included—at least \$5,000,000 for railroads in Alaska, to say nothing of any appropriations for rivers and harbors, public buildings, Reclamation Service, and \$40,000,000 for the ship-purchase bill. How, under these conditions, it can be considered that it will be sufficient for the next fiscal year, 1917, to obtain \$112,000,000 of new revenue, as stated in the President's message, is beyond me. It would seem that \$150,000,000 or \$200,000,000 additional would be nearer the amount required, which, of course, can not be definitely determined until the appropriation bills are made up.

Whatever may be thought with reference to the additional revenue needed, it is quite plain that the administration has brought the Treasury dangerously near bankruptcy, and by twisting and shifting its methods of bookkeeping has sought to conceal the real situation. The burdensome and vexatious direct taxes which have been levied in times of peace are clearly insufficient to maintain a reasonable working balance in the Treasury, but the prospect is that the American people will have still more stamps to moisten, in view of the need of the Treasury for additional revenue and the disposition of the administration to put the burden of its failure upon those who ought not to bear it. The Micawber of the Treasury will doubtless continue to exploit his visions, but out of all these masses of contradictory figures, in spite of the fog with which they have been covered, the people will understand that the National Treasury no longer has a real working balance.

Mr. Speaker, much will be said at this session with reference to proper preparation for defense, and we will be told that war may come suddenly and unexpectedly, like a bolt from a clear sky. Such being the situation, the first preparation that we should make is to create in the Treasury a free fund of at least \$50,000,000, which could be used for any emergency which might arise overnight. Until the Treasury is so supplied we will not be prepared for war, nor even for the incidents of peace. This bill is insufficient for that purpose and will not create such a fund, which will only be supplied by a protective

tariff under a Republican administration. [Long applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose this resolution, not on account of the resolution itself so much as because it seeks to fasten for another year upon the American people a tax that I believe to be essentially wrong in principle, because it is a tax burdensome and oppressive, and imposed on objects and ordinary transactions of business never before taxed in the history of this country except in time of war.

I realize, however, the condition that confronts us, and therefore I shall content myself with merely recording my name against the passage of this resolution and not attempting to block it either by obstruction or by amendment, much as it needs amendment.

The situation simply is—and it was brought out in the strenuously enthusiastic speech of the leader of the majority an hour ago [laughter on the Republican side]—that if we do not pass this resolution before the Christmas adjournment or recess the Treasury will be bankrupt.

It is useless to attempt to conceal the true state of affairs, either by wit or sophistry or financial legerdemain. To anyone who has at all followed the history of the Treasury balance for the past year the situation to-day is obvious. The fiscal year of 1915 started with a balance in the Treasury of \$145,835,502.10. On the 11th of the following June the balance had shrunk to \$17,780,831.39, a loss of more than \$127,000,000, or an average loss of more than \$10,000,000 a month. In the last few days of June, however, a windfall came; the screws had been turned and twisted to exact the last pound of flesh out of the payers of the income tax, and the balance rose on the 30th of June to \$82,025,716.03; not \$104,000,000, but to about \$82,000,000. Again the process of erosion set in, to such an extent that on the 30th of September the balance had fallen to \$40,898,894.26, a loss of more than \$41,000,000, or an average loss per month of more than \$13,000,000. Then, marvelous to relate, we awoke the next morning to find that the balance in the Treasury was announced to be \$128,063,545.23.

Was this another windfall, such as had come in the closing days of June? Had any money come into the Treasury? Had \$88,000,000, like manna from heaven, fallen into the Treasury? Not at all. There was actually less money in the Treasury on the 1st of October than there was on the day previous. We were told that the reason for it was that the Treasury Department had adopted a new method of bookkeeping; that the old method hitherto pursued by the administration had become antiquated, and a newer and more enlightened method had been adopted instead. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, there is nothing new about this method. It is as old as the hills. It has been going on ever since figures were invented. It is simply the process of padding figures to give to those interested a roseate, but an entirely false, view of the situation. [Applause on the Republican side.]

You have done, gentlemen, what you would have been the first to condemn if it had been done by any others. I shall refer to only one of the items that you have included in your Treasury available cash balance. Suppose a railroad company, for instance, in its statement to the public should include as a part of its available cash sums that have been appropriated for specific purposes only. What would you call it? I venture to believe that you gentlemen on the other side of this House would have called that "high finance" of the most pernicious kind, and you would have been right. You may call this system modern finance. I call it jugglery. But even these new and enlightened methods have not prevented the process of erosion of your Treasury balance from going on. Your \$128,000,000 had shrunk on the opening day of this Congress, December 6, to \$116,871,284.79. Yesterday morning it was \$107,600,970.35. You had lost over \$20,000,000 from the 1st of October, and you have lost over \$9,000,000 since this Congress has been in session. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, there is a perfectly easy way to find out what the Treasury balance is to-day. Subtract \$88,000,000, the amount you padded it with in October, from the present balance of \$107,000,000, and what is the answer? About \$20,000,000.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], now presiding over this House, need give himself no concern that the knowledge on this side of the House of the true state of affairs will encourage our rapacity. On the contrary, I will say to the gentleman from New York that it simply inspires in us only feelings of grave concern for the future of this country, so long as the

Democratic administration shall remain in power. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The fact is that our condition to-day is substantially the same as it was about the middle of last June, but we have not any wind-fall to look forward to, such as took place then. We have got to wait six months before the returns of the income tax come in, when we had then to wait only a week; and this paltry \$20,000,000 that to-day represents the real balance in the Treasury, when we consider that we have been losing about a million dollars a day since this Congress went into session, is apt right speedily, like the voyagers in the "Hunting of the Snark," "to softly and suddenly vanish away and never be heard from again." [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

You are right in one thing. There is urgent necessity, under your revenue system, of passing this resolution. We on this side have no disposition to prevent you, although we have been called unpatriotic. But we do not propose to stultify ourselves by voting to perpetuate even for a year a system of taxation odious and unjustifiable in time of peace in this country. [Applause on the Republican side.] That it is necessary now is only because your tariff law has proved itself not only destructive of industry, but impotent to raise the revenue necessary for the maintenance of this Government, war or no war. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The American people are patriotic. They are willing to pay their share of the expenses of Government, and they are willing to pay heavily of their treasure in time of stress and danger. But you will find that they do not like to pay emergency taxes when no emergency exists. You will find that they do not like to pay war taxes when there is no war. There would never have been any necessity for the taxes you are about to continue if you had not destroyed—deliberately destroyed—a large part of the revenue formerly collected at the customhouses of this country. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. FORDNEY. I yield five minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. LONGWORTH. You can not substantiate the claim that the European war is in any real degree responsible. Your deficit was growing before the war started or was even dreamed of, in spite of the fact that importations of enormous proportions have continued to flow and are to-day flowing into this country. It is not the quantity of the imports, but the duties imposed and collected upon them, that have made the deficit and played hob with your revenue.

As a discourager of American industry your tariff is a brilliant success. As a producer of revenue it is a sorry failure. The history of this administration abundantly illustrates the essential difference between the rival revenue policies of the Republican and Democratic Parties. Under our method stimulated trade and industry go hand in hand with adequate revenue. Under yours inadequate revenue walks over prostrate industry. [Applause on the Republican side.]

You may reply that to-day prosperity prevails in the land. Of course it does, but it is a sporadic prosperity, due almost entirely to our prodigious export trade, with which you have nothing whatever to do, and based upon the greatest calamity of the ages. Woe to American industry, I say, if this war shall cease and competitive conditions be restored before the Underwood law is repealed. [Applause on the Republican side.] Heaven protect American labor if this thing happens before protective duties are restored. [Applause on the Republican side.]

You say that this is but the beginning of the imposition of other and far-reaching direct taxes. If you are sincere, as we are on this side of the House, in your desire for adequate preparedness, you will need them, unless you are willing to adopt our method of raising revenue.

But this is not the time for the discussion of these questions. That will come later. In the meantime, we will not seek to prevent the prolongation for a year of your present method of direct taxation, but we suggest to you that in the future you may not find it so easy. We are for preparedness and we are willing to pay for it, but we propose to have something to say about the method by which necessary revenue shall be raised.

I now yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman used two minutes and yields back three minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman from North Carolina use some of his time now?

Mr. KITCHIN. We shall have but one more speech on this side, which will close the debate.

Mr. FORDNEY. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN].

Mr. SLOAN: Mr. Chairman, the approaching holiday season, with all its various festivities, is anticipated by all of us. There are special celebrations of events, important to some and observed with interest by all. In other times and other seasons great rulers and statesmen, on festal occasions like those now approaching, would undoubtedly have extended to the common people of the Nation the hand of generosity; but to-day this Congress, with the infliction of this burden of taxation, lands on the American people with the clenched fist of oppression. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The time is short, but I deem it a duty to protest against this burdensome, offensive, and repugnant tax.

But we are advised that we should not resent it, that we should not wince, and perhaps that is true; for to-day the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] is punishing the American people with a whip for their indiscretion in 1912, while from yonder platform on the 7th of December the President of the United States announced that later on we would be punished with a scorpion in the form of a bill that will add to the terms of this burdensome law.

But the people are patient. The people are long-suffering. I presume they will bend under the load and punishment of that indiscretion which turned the control of this Government over to cunning contrivers of taxes. But it seems to me that they will be warranted in being patient; because, looking forward, they know that there must come an end of all things, and that among the days that are to come, March 4, 1917, looms up in the distance. Were not the elections of last November to the party in control an emphatic notice to quit? [Applause on the Republican side.]

The leader of the majority in his speech presenting this resolution said it was thought when this bill was presented last year that the war would have closed by the 1st of January, 1916. If that was true, then the bill was not drawn with reference to that thought, because the bill that was presented in this House and voted upon in this House fixed no limitation to the life of the tax law, save and except the stamp tax. It was so cunningly arranged that the bill would not only outlast the European war, but so far as this administration is concerned it would be a perpetual tax. Although I called this fact to the attention of the majority of this House in that Congress—a great deal larger majority, by the way, than the present one—no attention was paid to it, and it remained for the Senate to take up the feature of limitation and place upon the bill the limitation which we find in the present law.

I am sorry that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL] saw fit to impugn and attack the patriotism of this side of the House. Yet my sorrow is diminished a great deal when I remember that if from any source on earth the great body of people represented by those on this side of the House would have their patriotism impugned, it would be by the gentleman from Tennessee. [Applause on the Republican side.] The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL] said that in the next campaign he would "go out and stand flat-footed"—I would like to see the gentleman standing flat-footed—upon the Baltimore platform, with its bending, warping, breaking, vanishing planks. A moving picture of that spectacle sold to advantage would finance the next campaign of almost any anti-Democratic Party to victory. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The gentleman said that we had a panic in 1907 and would charge it to Republican policies. I say this to the gentleman from Tennessee, that during the first calendar year in which the Underwood tariff law was in operation there were more failures in the United States, carrying a larger excess of liabilities over assets, than in 1907, 1908, or any other year in the history of this Nation. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I submit a record of the number of failures and the excess of liabilities over assets for certain record calendar years in our recent history.

Year.	Number.	Excess of liabilities over assets.
1914.....	16,759	\$162,313,407
1913.....	14,553	134,800,000
1908.....	14,044	127,500,000
1907.....	10,265	95,800,000
1896.....	15,094	99,100,000
1893.....	15,508	150,600,000

This shows 1914 as having 1,251 more failures than the next highest year in our history. It shows the excess of liability over assets for 1914, \$11,713,407 more than in 1893 and \$66,513,407 over 1907.

And during 1914, which had seven months of the Underwood tariff law—and there was no war going in Europe—there was a greater shrinkage in values of sound and stable properties and securities, more idle freight cars, and more laborers thrown out of employment than in any other year in our national history.

I oppose this bill because it is founded on two definite wrongs. One is that if the party in power had lived up to their pledge solemnly made in Baltimore, for that economy for which the chairman of this committee so vainly pleaded, there would be money in the Treasury now to run this Government. Further than that, if the Underwood tariff law had been fair to all the industries of this country, and if it had been drawn in line with its pledge for the raising of revenue, and had not been a rank discrimination between industries and between sections, there would still be considerable money in the Treasury to run this Government and this infamous tax need not have been extended.

Ah, but the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL] said that on a former occasion, when this side of the House presented a revenue bill of similar character, that side—the Democratic—of the House, substantially to a man, patriotically supported it. I have before me the record of the votes on that bill. The bill was passed April 29, 1898. As I read that list I find that not only on the passage of that bill but when it came back from the Senate and House conferees the vote was Republicans for the bill and Democrats against it, with a few marked exceptions on either side. I find that Mr. Cummings, of New York, and Gen. Joseph Wheeler stood almost alone on their side of the House supporting the bill, while the great mass of their partisans voted against the bill, although this Nation was then actually involved in a great war.

I note among those voting against that bill, not to reflect upon them, but to refute the statement of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL], the following, who are still in public life: ADAMSON, BROUSSARD, CLARK, HENRY, LLOYD, MOON, SHAFROTH, SIMS, SLAYDEN, SPARKMAN, STEPHENS, SWANSON, TALBOTT, and UNDERWOOD.

I recently reread, Mr. Chairman, that matchless lecture of Wendell Phillips on "The Lost Arts." I was interested in the manner in which he read into the record of the ancient ruins and writings, the inventions, discoveries, and appliances that we call our modern arts. But in all the list presented in his matchless manner and eloquence I found not the art of bookkeeping. That noble art seems not to have been rediscovered by the ingenious and eloquent Wendell. A reference might be found to it in the writings of the recording angel; but whatever there was anciently to that profession it never reached the perfection of modern official application.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska two minutes more.

Mr. SLOAN. We who in our homes from day to day during vacation saw the falling column of cash in the National Treasury with grave apprehension, wondered what soon must occur. On the last day of September or the first of October, or in the witching hour between the months when "graveyards yawn," that a magician in the Treasury waved his wand, and suddenly debts became credits, liabilities became assets, and obligations became resources. It exemplified what old Si Smith in our country said after he failed in business. When he was asked what he was going to do, he said: "I am going to live on the interest of my debts." So it is expected that the Treasury of the United States will prosper and grow on what it owes. [Laughter.]

The people object to this expense, because if they have a magician in the Treasury who can by the waving of a wand, or the exercise of a decree or fiat, breathe into or wish \$80,000,000 into the Treasury, what is the use of the tax? Why McAdoo about it? [Laughter.] Wave the wand and do away with the tax, or else what is the use of having a magician in the Treasury.

I was at Leavenworth a few years ago, taking depositions in the institution down there belonging to the Government, where the long-term guests of the United States are housed, fed, and worked. My attention was called to a group called "the bankers squad." I asked one of them why he was not in his bank. He said: "Well, I evolved a new system of bookkeeping, which I followed for a couple of years until the authorities uncovered it, and that is why I am not in the bank." [Laughter.]

That is one reason why the bookkeeper at the end of the Avenue will not be long retained by the people of the United States. If there is one important fact established from the authoritative statements of the majority leader in the preference of his party

for taxes upon persons, business, and industries of Americans, rather than upon the foreign products, I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the foreign producers who would enjoy the American market, which heretofore was and hereafter is to be the best in the world, should pay a large share of the American taxes, and not the American laborers, farmers, and business men. [Applause.]

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON]. [Applause.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, in five minutes' time I can not undertake to exhaustively talk about this bill or the condition of the Treasury. In that five minutes of time, however, I desire to be entirely practical and entirely nonpartisan. [Laughter.] Gentlemen on the other side laugh, all right. The proof of the pudding is in the eating of it. I am an American citizen; I am a Republican. I disagree with the other side of the House touching taxation, in many other respects, but especially from an economic standpoint. They had full power to put their policy on the statute book. Probably they were bound to do it. I guess they were, under their platform, and they kept it in that respect. We have had a trial of it. You say on account of the war there is a deficit; we say the deficit happened before the war.

But what I say and what you say does not make it correct. I have not the time to discuss what the fact is, but it is absolutely certain that, as an American citizen and a Representative, it is my duty to contribute to the welfare of the Republic, and I am ready to do it. And yet I must be allowed the poor privilege of saying how you might have done it better, not only for public sentiment, but for the Treasury and the well-being of all the people.

Here is a revenue law called a war-revenue tax law that will expire the last day of this year. You want to extend it. Your President, when he addressed the House a few days ago, to which address I listened with great attention, said that to continue this law would not be sufficient; that you have large amounts of money to gather into the Treasury from taxation, and he recommended how that should be done. I do not agree with his recommendations. I am for appropriating money where the public welfare requires and for providing money to pay the appropriations. Now, I put it to that side of the House in all fairness. You gave notice and your President has given notice that this is only a starter; that later on in this session, between this and the close of the fiscal year on the 30th of June, you are again to bring in revenue bills that will increase taxation. Do you not think that when you pass this bill you might limit it to three months or six months, or, perchance, to the end of this session of Congress? It seems to me that it ought to be so limited, and then when you bring in other tax bills you can include this bill and we can take the dose all at one time.

There is another way to get revenue. The President is not pleased with it. There are \$222,000,000 of Panama bonds in the Treasury. We proposed when we authorized that work to build it by bonds, but lo and behold, under a Republican policy, with constantly increasing expenses, the Treasury was filled and filled until we paid all the expenditures, and then, lo and behold, there were \$222,000,000 of these bonds that we did not use, because we paid all of the expenses out of the Treasury, money that came in under the Republican policy. [Applause.] These bonds can be, under the law, issued by the President at any time and the proceeds placed in the Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes more to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, during this Congress I hope to ease my mind and have an hour, and possibly, if I could get a good start, an hour and a half [laughter]; but that is in the future. Oh, you say, we do not want to increase the debt—get the money by internal taxation. That is what the President said. Great heavens! Under Republican policies we paid substantially three billions of dollars of debt that was made to preserve the Union, and since that time we have paid five billions of dollars, under Republican policies, without borrowing to pay the pensions, and the expenses of the Government mounted up and doubled again and again, and you the first year you came into power increased appropriations so that the aggregate appropriated was greater than ever made to carry on the Government. As an American citizen, I stand to-day ready to do my duty. Oh, memory! Mr. Chairman, I had the honor of being the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations when Mr. Reed was in the Speaker's chair at the beginning of the Spanish War. We made at that time a revenue bill. You would

not vote for it. You offered a substitute, and the present honored Speaker of this House, if my recollection does not play me false, at that time said as to a man who has since crossed over—the gentleman from New York, Mr. Cummings, possibly applying it to four or five other Democrats—that he was a traitor to his party.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, as I shall not be able to say what I desire in 10 minutes, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, if I were a cartoonist I would draw two pictures which I think would adequately describe the predicament in which the Democratic Party finds itself on the revenue question. First, I would depict a happy home in the country, labeled "1912," with everything bright and cheerful, and the children jumping into the family wagon, on their way to school. I would have the young teacher, who had just arrived from the city, offer his services as driver, with a query floating up from the old farmer as to whether he knew how to drive, and a monosyllabic "Sure" emerging from the lips of the theoretical young man. In the second picture, labeled "1915," I would have the farmer and his friends rushing to the scene of a disaster along the roadside, where the horse, wagon, and children had all been dumped into the ditch. I would picture the young schoolmaster whistling on high ground. When the farmer and his friends come upon the scene inquiring as to the reason for the upset, I would have the young man ejaculate something about "the European war" [laughter on the Republican side], and if this did not appease the irate parent, I would have him answer in honeyed phrases, "It is only psychological, my dear man, and therefore easy of adjustment. If you and your friends will erect a derrick and apply a little of your valuable time to our new system of bookkeeping efficiency it will be perfectly easy for me to continue to guide the footsteps of your children in the pathway of knowledge." [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, we all ought to sympathize keenly and deeply with our friends on the other side this afternoon. The eloquent speech of the brilliant leader of the Democratic majority, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN], is worth treasuring in our memory for many years, because it went so thoroughly into details as to the reasons why the Democratic Party dumped our apple cart over in the roadside and as to why that party is now appealing to us to kindly erect a derrick to help it out.

I do not believe I have ever heard the gentleman more convincing, more zealous, or more earnest in the cause of the administration than he was this morning when he presented his resolution. [Laughter.]

And the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL]. How he did lambaste the Republicans for their indifference to this proposition! He intimated even that we were unresponsive and "mad." The gentleman from Tennessee seemed to think our tempers to-day were uncontrollable and that we were intensely unpatriotic. But the gentleman from Tennessee entirely overshot the mark.

There are some of us on this side of the House, most of us, I am confident, who are in a most delightful frame of mind to-day. We understand now exactly how deep is the hole into which the Democratic Party has sunk. They dug that hole for themselves, and we observe how anxious they are that we shall join them in helping to get them out of that hole. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

Do the new Members of the House who have come in this session recall reading any of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS prior to 1912? If not, I commend to them some of the powerful utterances of gentlemen on the other side, who charged that all we said about prosperity under the protective tariff in the United States was moonshine.

Now when they have got control and have had a chance to put into effect their theories and policies there is a change over the surface of the moon. We can not help making note of it.

Do any of you Members who sat in the House and listened in former years to denunciations of Republican policies and prosperity—do any of you recall how unpatriotic then were those who stood for a protective tariff? Do you recall that the men who established industries were crooks and criminals? Do you remember how the trusts that were supposed to control the Gov-

ernment then were to be dethroned when the Democratic Party came into power? Do you recall the platform of the Baltimore convention and those fierce denunciations of the party in power? Do you remember how the appeal for economy welled up from the hearts of the people's champions on the other side, and how they were going to afford the people relief from the burdens of taxation "placed upon them by Republican prosperity," and how everything would be lovely and the goose would honk high when they came into power? Well, it is all over. [Applause.] It was all the result of a split in the Republican Party, enabling a minority party to slip into power.

Do you remember also how the distinguished gentleman [Mr. FITZGERALD] who ornaments the chair at the present time rose in his place as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and in one of his most eloquent speeches undertook from his own side to show the utter incompetency of the Democratic Party to manage anything, appealing in the name of high heaven, as it were, that those who were seeking loot from the Government, who were undertaking to obtain positions from the Government, should be held in check lest the Democratic Party should go down in disgrace? Well, it all comes back to us now. And the remarks, also, of the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson], who said that he did not care if the Republican Members did make capital of his utterances. Why, in the light of all these incidents, should Republicans go "mad" in contemplating the predicament of our Democratic friends?

And who does not recall the first message of the President of the United States when, following the lead that has not been followed since the days of Thomas Jefferson, he mounted the throne yonder, and told us that the industries of the United States were to be overthrown if there was anything in them in the nature of artificial protection? Do you recall how we were told that the manufacturers, those who employed labor in the United States, must "match their wits against the wits of the world"? How, in effect, they must go out and pay \$3 a day for labor in the United States and compete with Germany, paying \$1 a day, and other countries paying less? Do you recall how in the six months following that pronouncement from "the throne" yonder the entire country felt the effects of Democratic rule, and how in six months the importations piled up in the customhouses and the revenues steadily decreased? Yes; the revenues went down as the imports increased; the mills in the United States stopped running, and our purchasing power went over to the foreigner. The foreigner, you remember, got our business; wages and profits made under a Republican administration were dispelled, and still there was no war.

Then, do you remember how they destroyed the trusts? I wish you would look over the lists they presented us and tell us whether they destroyed the Sugar Trust when they took the duty off, or promised to, proposing to pass into the pockets of the great importers more than \$50,000,000 per annum that had formerly gone into the Treasury to the relief of the consumers of sugar in the United States. I wish, also, you would consider how they reduced the cost of living. Yesterday, from the rostrum there, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TAVENNER], a sturdy young Democrat, received intense and thunderous applause when he told us how the cost of living had raised higher and higher during the period the Democrats had been in power. He evidently did not intend to—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to quote briefly from a speech made by me on the war-tax question September 21, 1914, when the Underwood low-tariff law had been in effect for more than 11 months and when the European war had been under way for only about 7 weeks. The statement therein made is in full accord with the report of the minority of the Ways and Means Committee, which insists that the effect of the low-tariff law has been to decrease revenue and to increase imports, and that an extension of the war tax is inexcusable.

On September 14, prior to the passage of the original war-tax law, I said:

TERRIFIC LOSSES TO AMERICANS.

From January 1, 1914, to the end of July, 1914, the loss of revenue under the Underwood law, as compared with the Republican Payne law, was upward of \$23,000,000. In the same seven months the damage done to the country by the same Democratic law was pointedly shown in relation to articles manufactured for consumption and crude materials entering into their manufacture. Nothing could better illustrate the effect of a low tariff upon American labor, perhaps, than these particular statistics. Of manufactured articles made by foreign labor and sent over to the United States ready for consumption, there was a gain in imports under the Democratic law of more than \$39,000,000. In imports of materials for further use in manufacturing such as workmen might have made in the United States there was a decrease of

approximately \$27,000,000. In other words, the low tariff in these respects gave the work to the foreigner and took it away from the workmen in the United States. Carrying the illustration further, it developed that the balance of export trade in our favor under the Payne law in 1913 was \$308,000,000, while under the Democratic law in 1914 it was \$60,000,000, or a falling off of more than \$248,000,000. While we were buying from the foreigner and giving him additional work to do for us we were selling him less of our goods and depriving ourselves of work that American workmen would have enjoyed, and all this in the very few months the Democratic law was on trial.

Figures like these do not sustain the Democratic contention that the war in Europe is the basic cause of the disarrangement of our Government finances. Nor do they entertain this view who have experienced the disturbance of business and the loss of labor from month to month as the Democratic tariff proceeded along its deadly course.

DOES NOT LOOK LIKE A WAR BURDEN.

The accident of the war does not explain the continued increase of imports in certain of our ports, for the month of August during the war, nor the continued decrease of exports upon which under Republican conditions we would now be deriving a return of foreign gold.

Figures quoted by the Public Ledger, of Philadelphia, indicate that the imports at that port in August were practically "the same in value as in the corresponding month last year, and that the duties collected decreased \$959,000; also that while Boston imports increased \$3,700,000 in August the duties collected decreased \$682,000. Here is a falling off in revenue of \$1,641,000 in two cities notwithstanding an increase in imports. The business done at the customhouse in New York gives only slight justification to the claim that the total August decrease of \$10,000,000 in revenues is due to the war, for the value of imports fell off \$15,000,000 and the amount of duty collected decreased \$7,000,000. But the average rate of duty in New York in August last year was 25 per cent and this year it was 19.8 per cent. If the same rate of duty had been collected this year as last the decrease would have been less than \$4,000,000 instead of \$7,000,000, and if the same rate of duties had been collected in Philadelphia and in Boston the decrease in revenues at the customhouses in these three cities would have been only \$3,800,000 instead of \$8,641,000.

"Nearly \$5,000,000 of the decrease in revenues at the three ports is traceable directly to the changes made in the tariff by the Underwood law. The present Congress is responsible for this deficit and the country will be persuaded of that fact before the congressional campaign is many weeks older."

THE DEMOCRATIC LAW IN OPERATION.

Figures showing duties collected from customs, with increases and decreases under the Payne and Underwood laws, respectively, as I have been able to get them from the Department of Commerce, are as follows:

Duties collected from customs.

	Payne law, 1912-13.	Underwood law, 1913-14.	Increase (+) or decrease (-).
October.....	\$30,216,824.02	\$50,138,049.37	+\$19,921,225.35
November.....	25,666,353.25	21,173,627.85	- 4,492,725.40
December.....	24,248,161.30	21,510,139.99	- 2,738,021.31
January.....	20,334,124.09	23,528,079.83	+ 3,193,955.74
February.....	27,605,115.83	17,609,603.70	- 9,995,512.13
March.....	27,457,489.20	25,927,212.90	- 1,530,276.30
April.....	23,693,966.76	22,232,766.57	- 1,461,200.19
May.....	20,434,749.21	20,800,573.25	- 365,824.04
June.....	23,668,598.63	23,553,447.58	- 115,151.05
July.....	27,806,654.54	22,988,465.04	- 4,818,189.50
August.....	30,934,952.44	19,431,362.52	- 11,503,589.92
Total.....	291,066,989.27	268,893,328.60	- 22,173,660.67

WE ARE NOT MAD.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, deficiencies were inevitable under the low-tariff law, apart from the fearful consequences to labor and business which our friends upon the other side are now prone to forget, because the European war has given them an excuse to talk about prosperity.

Why should we be "mad," as the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL] has indicated, when the whole Republican case has been proven, and when even the President of the United States in his proper person has been obliged to admit the Democratic financial delinquency to the Members of Congress? Gentlemen upon the other side persist in saying that the European war is responsible for their dilemma. With equal facility they point to the European war as the cause of the prosperity which they contend the country now enjoys. For one I do not like to forget the stress that was laid upon the "iniquity" of protection during the campaign of 1912. The Democratic platform of Baltimore was filled with denunciation of this wholesome Republican policy, and during his campaign the President stood upon that platform, contending that it was not "molasses to catch flies."

DENOUNCING THE TARIFF SYSTEM.

The President talked then as the Democratic leaders generally talked. They were all against the Republican doctrine. As they saw it, and as they made others believe, protection was the "breeder of trusts"; it was the cruel agency of monopoly; it was the handmaiden of the capitalistic class. A glossary of the hideous adjectives applied to the protective system in the campaign of 1912 would fill a book, and the President did not go back on this plank of the platform in his first message to Congress. He said we should not protect those things that

were artificial, but should get "back to nature." We should "whet our wits against the wits of the world." There was no war cloud visible in the European sky when this declaration was made, so that the President and his followers had a free foot to work out their theory and to abide by the result. It is only recalling history to observe that the first six months of the new system were months of uncertainty, unemployment, and business loss. That the new law would produce sufficient revenue to run the Government on "the tariff for revenue" basis was soon disproven.

THE WILD HORSES UNRESTRAINED.

That the Democratic Party could or would practice economy was not to be tolerated. "The proof of the pudding is in the eating of it," and having the pudding, the hungry wild horses of Democracy were not to be kept from the trough. Witness the eloquent utterances of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] a member of the Appropriations Committee of the Democratic Congress now in complete control of the revenues of the Nation. In the second session of the Sixty-third Congress, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 178, Mr. Sisson said:

You all recall that some years ago, within the recollection of every man on the floor of this House, the newspapers headlined a billion-dollar Congress, and it was like a fire bell at night. Mr. Reed was Speaker, and we were spending a billion dollars in one Congress, or \$500,000,000 a year. You Republicans will remember how the charges were rung then over all the country against you. You will remember Mr. Reed's laconic reply, to the effect that we had a billion-dollar Government. That was the only answer that could be made to the proposition. Now the Democrats are in power, and I am afraid, gentlemen of the House, that we will expend more money this year than has ever been expended in the history of this Government before in any one year. Perhaps it may be necessary and the people may be demanding it, but if that is true, we have wrongfully criticized the Republican Party, and we ought to apologize to them for charging them with spending money and being criminally extravagant in the administration of the affairs of this Government.

EXTRAVAGANCE RUNNING RAMPANT.

Later on, April 3, 1914, struggling to stem the tide of extravagance in which the Democratic Congress was indulging, Mr. Sisson again dared to speak the truth.

Principle—

He said—

has gone to the four winds of the earth, and we are writing ourselves down in the history of the country as being the most outrageously and most criminally extravagant Congress that ever sat on the American Continent. I said that in a speech before, in the last session, and when I made that speech Members of the Democratic House came to me and asked me not to put it into the RECORD, because it would be used by the Republicans in their campaign book. Let them use it. * * * You may use the statement now, gentlemen, because when Democrats get to be so violently extravagant that it makes its own record look bad as compared to the very marked record of the Republicans, I must apologize to you Republicans for having ever used the words "criminally extravagant" in criticizing the appropriations that you made, for if that expression "criminally extravagant" was proper to apply to you, my God! the English language has never found an adjective strong enough to apply to Democratic extravagance.

EASIER TO SPEND THAN EARN.

But the gentleman from Mississippi was not the only Member upon the other side of the House who gave conscientious expression to his innermost thoughts. We have another witness, than whom no other more expert in the finances of the Government can be summoned. It was the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations himself, the distinguished Representative from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD]. Not once but often did the chairman of the Appropriations Committee sound warnings of the rocks ahead of the administration. Coming from a great community, which is often the subject of criticism because of the bigness of its commercial and financial transactions, the gentleman from New York knew the difference between raising funds for the maintenance of the Government and the spending of them. He knew from practical experience that while it is easy to spend money it is not so easy to earn it. And so by reason of the exactions of those sections of the country which are ever ready to spend more money than they contribute to the common fund, we find him saying (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 3d sess., 62d Cong., Feb. 11, 1913):

THE CHAIRMAN'S ADMONITION.

I believe that there is in the contingent fund of the House to-day, or there was about a week ago, \$100, and there are requests pending for \$100,000 to supply the deficiencies for the balance of this fiscal year.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has not overexaggerated the picture as to what is likely to happen at this session of Congress. No one can tell just how much the appropriations at this session will be, but I think it is a conservative estimate to say, Mr. Speaker, that they will far exceed the appropriations that have been made at any session in the history of the Government.

I have done my part and have done my best in some way to curtail the expenditures: not to interfere with the legitimate functions and services of the Government, but to stop the expenditure of public moneys to gratify every whim and to please every fancy, either of in-

dividuals or of Members. Everyone seems possessed, however, of a determination to obtain moneys to maintain and extend that particular branch of the public service in which he or his constituents is particularly interested and then to make fragmentary, spasmodic efforts to save in some other direction in which neither he nor his constituents will be affected.

Such a condition can not long continue. I understand that the bills reported at this session of Congress will probably provide for the expenditure of the \$100,000,000 which it is anticipated will be raised by an income tax. It reminds me somewhat of an incident that occurred in the Committee on Appropriations when \$27,000 was requested for a certain public service in anticipation of the enactment of some legislation at the next session of Congress.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that unless this side of the House wakes up to a sense of its responsibility, not only will the appropriations be grossly extravagant, but they will amount to so much that talk of a revision downward of the tariff will be the most hollow mockery.

LAVISH IN PROMISE; SCANT ON PERFORMANCE.

Prior to all this the Democratic Party, at Baltimore, in its platform of 1912, after denouncing the Republican tariff and charging to it responsibility for the high cost of living, made this deliberate but now seemingly ridiculous pronouncement to a credulous world:

We denounce the profligate waste of the money wrung from the people by oppressive taxation through the lavish appropriations of recent Republican Congresses, which have kept taxes high and reduced the purchasing power of the people's toil. We demand a return to that simplicity and economy which befits a democratic government and a reduction in the number of useless offices, the salaries of which drain the substance of the people.

Lavish in promise, but scant on performance. "The profligate waste" which the Democrats were going to correct was made to exceed anything that has ever occurred in the way of extravagance in the history of the Nation. That part of the Baltimore platform which promised to check waste was as sticky as molasses only, in that it did fool many of the people.

And as to the charge that "recent Republican Congresses" "have kept taxes high and reduced the purchasing power of the people's toil," we have these deplorable evidences of the saccharine quality of the Baltimore platform. Taxes were not reduced; they were increased. The loss of tariff revenue obliged the party to impose an income tax, which is likely to grow more burdensome, and a war tax of \$100,000,000 in time of peace. All this the people are directly bound to pay.

A MEDLEY OF BROKEN PROMISES.

The extension of this unnecessary and burdensome war tax, as contemplated by the existing resolution, is a confession of Democratic inadequacy to the task of raising revenue to run the Government. The sugary provision about "the purchasing power of the people's toil" was almost a sacrilege in view of the unemployment and distress that prevailed immediately after the Democratic Party came into power. As for "simplicity and economy which befits a democratic government," inquiring minds are referred to the luminous remarks of the gentleman from Mississippi and the gentleman from New York. There has been no "simplicity," nor has there been any "economy" under the new régime. "A reduction in the number of useless offices" was a promise which has been responded to by a constantly increasing demand to provide for "deserving Democrats" in continental United States, throughout our colonial possessions, and wherever the ramifications of our diplomatic and consular services extend.

"Simplicity and economy" are terms which, carried to the immortal Jefferson in the silent shade of Monticello, would cause him to turn in his grave.

A QUESTION OF MONEY; THAT IS ALL.

And the administration does not deny it. Leading Democrats do not deny it. Thinking men, like former Gov. Colquitt, of Texas, assert it. The able Secretary of the Treasury, who shaped up our Federal reserve act for the distribution of public funds to the four corners of the earth, and who devised the ship-purchase bill to still further increase the volume of Democratic expenditures, has given us statements from day to day which attempt to convince Congress that we are still in funds, while his official reports indicate that we are steadily falling behind not only in revenue collections through the customhouses but in internal revenue collected from liquors and tobacco. And it is noteworthy that liquor and tobacco are in the nature of luxuries that have borne heavily of our taxes, and if rumor be true are to serve further as burden bearers in that capacity.

In the closing pages of his report the Secretary of the Treasury of an administration that was to conduct the Government on a tariff-for-revenue basis, that was to destroy the Republican tariff, dissolve the trusts, reduce the cost of living, and practice economy, tells us in the mildest possible language that it will be necessary to raise at least \$112,000,000 for the fiscal year 1917 over and above all that we are now raising, plus the customs

revenue, plus the internal revenue, plus the income and corporation taxes, and plus the burdensome war tax.

BACK TO THE PROTECTIVE TARIFF.

It is evident—

Says the Secretary—

that the emergency revenue measure and the existing duty on raw sugars can be continued with advantage.

Horrors! Are we to accept the Republican doctrine on sugars for the protection of the planters of Louisiana and of the Hawaiian Islands. "If we are so soon to be done for," we tariff-for-revenue Democrats, "what were we ever begun for?"

This being done—

Continues the Secretary—

we now have to consider the new forms of taxation which must be resorted to for the purpose of providing the additional revenues required, the major part of which is needed to carry out the enlarged program for national defense. The total amount so required for the year 1917 is \$112,806,394.22.

SOME MORE THINGS TO TAX.

The Secretary does not like the idea of issuing Panama Canal bonds, but he thinks additional funds to save the Nation's credit "can easily be raised by internal taxation without appreciable burdens upon the American people."

Then suggesting that more money may be obtained by extending the income tax and by imposing a tax on "such products as gasoline, crude and refined oils, horsepower of automobiles and other internal-combustion engines, and various other things."

He will "be glad to place at the disposal of the Congress all information in the possession of the department which may be useful to the Congress" to put this program over on the people.

Here is the pleasant job that the Democratic administration is putting up to a Democratic Congress, and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL] may be assured that the Republican Members are not so "mad" about it as are some of their brethren upon the Democratic side. The hole was not dug by Republicans. It was the inevitable consequence of the sugar-coated platform which the Baltimore convention passed along to the voters of the country, who occasionally have a sweet tooth.

THE PRESIDENT STANDS BY.

But to the credit of the President of the United States be it said that he stands by his Secretary of the Treasury. In his address to both branches of Congress December 7, 1915, the President told us of the influence of the European war upon our revenues. Prosperity was returning, but the revenues were shy. When the President disposed of the other questions confronting the Nation and took up for discussion the condition of the Treasury he said:

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

On the 30th of June last there was an available balance in the general fund of the Treasury of \$104,170,105.78. The total estimated receipts for the year 1916, on the assumption that the emergency revenue measure passed by the last Congress will not be extended beyond its present limit, the 31st of December, 1915, and that the present duty of 1 cent per pound on sugar will be discontinued after the 1st of May, 1916, will be \$670,365,500. The balance of June last and these estimated revenues come, therefore, to a grand total of \$774,535,605.78. The total estimated disbursements for the present fiscal year, including \$25,000,000 for the Panama Canal, \$12,000,000 for probable deficiency appropriations, and \$50,000 for miscellaneous debt redemptions, will be \$753,891,000; and the balance in the general fund of the Treasury will be reduced to \$20,644,605.78. The emergency revenue act, if continued beyond its present time limitation, would produce, during the half year then remaining, about \$41,000,000. The duty of 1 cent per pound on sugar, if continued, would produce during the two months of the fiscal year remaining after the 1st of May, about \$15,000,000. These two sums, amounting together to \$56,000,000, if added to the revenues of the second half of the fiscal year, would yield the Treasury at the end of the year an available balance of \$76,644,605.78.

FINANCES FOR 1917.

The additional revenues required to carry out the program of military and naval preparation of which I have spoken would, as at present estimated, be for the fiscal year 1917, \$93,800,000. Those figures, taken with the figures for the present fiscal year, which I have already given, disclose our financial problem for the year 1917. Assuming that the taxes imposed by the emergency-revenue act and the present duty on sugar are to be discontinued, and that the balance at the close of the present fiscal year will be only \$20,644,605.78, that the disbursements for the Panama Canal will again be about \$25,000,000, and that the additional expenditures for the Army and Navy are authorized by the Congress, the deficit in the general fund of the Treasury on the 30th of June, 1917, will be nearly \$235,000,000. To this sum at least \$50,000,000 should be added to represent a safe working balance for the Treasury, and \$12,000,000 to include the usual deficiency estimates in 1917; and these additions would make a total deficit of some \$297,000,000. If the present taxes should be continued throughout this year and the next, however, there would be a balance in the Treasury of some \$76,500,000 at the end of the present fiscal year, and a deficit at the end of the next year of only some \$50,000,000, or, reckoning in \$62,900,000 for deficiency appropriations and a safe Treasury balance at the end of the year, a total deficit of some \$112,000,000. The obvious moral of the figures is that it is a plain counsel of prudence to continue all of the present taxes or their equivalents, and confine

ourselves to the problem of providing \$112,000,000 of new revenue rather than \$297,000,000.

SOURCES OF EXTRA REVENUE.

How shall we obtain the new revenues? We are frequently reminded that there are many millions of bonds which the Treasury is authorized under existing law to sell to reimburse the sums paid out of current revenues for the construction of the Panama Canal; and it is true that bonds to the amount of approximately \$222,000,000 are now available for that purpose. Prior to 1913 \$134,631,980 of these bonds had actually been sold to recoup the expenditures at the Isthmus and now constitute a considerable item of the public debt. But I for one do not believe that the people of this country approve of postponing the payment of their bills. Borrowing money is short-sighted finance. It can be justified only when permanent things are to be accomplished which many generations will certainly benefit by and which it seems hardly fair that a single generation should pay for. The objects we are now proposing to spend money for can not be so classified, except in the sense that everything wisely done may be said to be done in the interest of posterity as well as in our own. It seems to me a clear dictate of prudent statesmanship and frank finance that in what we are now, I hope, about to undertake we should pay as we go. The people of the country are entitled to know just what burdens of taxation they are to carry, and to know from the outset, now. The new bills should be paid by internal taxation.

EXTEND INCOME TAX.

To what sources, then, shall we turn? This is so peculiarly a question which the gentlemen of the House of Representatives are expected under the Constitution to propose an answer to that you will hardly expect me to do more than discuss it in very general terms. We should be following an almost universal example of modern governments if we were to draw the greater part or even the whole of the revenues we need from the income taxes. By somewhat lowering the present limits of exemption and the figure at which the surtax shall begin to be imposed, and by increasing, step by step throughout the present graduation, the surtax itself, the income taxes as at present apportioned would yield sums sufficient to balance the books of the Treasury at the end of the fiscal year 1917 without anywhere making the burden unreasonably or oppressively heavy. The precise reckonings are fully and accurately set out in the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, which will be immediately laid before you.

And there are many additional sources of revenue which can justly be resorted to without hampering the industries of the country or putting any too great charge upon individual expenditure. A tax of 1 cent per gallon on gasoline and naphtha would yield, at the present estimated production, \$10,000,000; a tax of 50 cents per horsepower on automobiles and internal explosion engines, \$15,000,000; a stamp tax on bank checks, probably \$18,000,000; a tax of 25 cents per ton on pig iron, \$10,000,000; a tax of 25 cents per ton on fabricated iron and steel, probably \$10,000,000. In a country of great industries like this it ought to be easy to distribute the burdens of taxation without making them anywhere bear too heavily or too exclusively upon any one set of persons or undertakings. What is clear is that the industry of this generation should pay the bills of this generation.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, we are no longer in doubt as to the situation. It is no longer a question of the iniquitous tariff or of grinding trusts and corporations, of increased cost of living, or of Republican extravagance—the one sole and absorbing problem of the administration is deficiency, a Democratic deficiency in the place of a Republican surplus, a deficiency that must continue to grow, with increasing taxes and burdens upon the people, through no fault of the Republican Party, but in spite of all its admonitions and warnings. The Democratic platform at Baltimore may not have been a platform with which to “catch flies,” but it was sufficient to prove the utter inefficiency of the pet Democratic theories. Look at it as we may, the cold, hard facts stare us in the face. The Government is in financial distress, the people are unduly burdened now, and unless and until a just and equitable protective-tariff system is restored no remedy is in sight.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield seven minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN]. [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I read a squib in a newspaper the other day to this effect: An Italian appeared before a court to make application for naturalization papers, and in the course of the examination the judge inquired of him if he belonged to any society that was inimical to the interests of the United States, and he said that he was a Democrat. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] And I think that no society that could be organized anywhere within the boundaries of the United States could have done more harm to the American people than the Democrats have done since the inauguration of President Wilson to the Presidency.

They have opened the ports of America to the markets of the world. They have closed the factories and the workshops and thrown all the American workmen out of employment. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] They have taxed them beyond every hope and reason, and to-day we pay every kind of a tax under the sun.

They came into power on the promise of an economical expenditure of the public money. They have been most recklessly extravagant in that respect of any party that ever existed. During the last Congress they spent \$166,000,000 more than the greatest expenditure during any Republican Congress in the history of America. If you had kept yourselves within reasonable bounds of expenditure, you would not be called upon to tax the people under this iniquitous law that is before us

to-day. If by any chance some frugal man during prosperous times in this country was able to accumulate money enough to buy a home, and he bought it at any time since the enactment of this law, he would find himself compelled to pay into the Treasury of the United States 50 cents on every \$500 of the purchase price. And if by some unfortunate chance he was thrown out of employment since the Democratic Party came into power and he had a little home which he had been able to buy before that, but was obliged because of his idleness to put a mortgage on it, he would feel himself obliged to pay 50 cents on every \$500 of the mortgage as a result of this law.

The people throughout the land everywhere are protesting against the iniquity of this law. They do not want it renewed. It ought not to be. It ought never to have been enacted. It was enacted at the request of the President of the United States, in the name of war in days of peace. It was enacted because of the necessity for funds. It was enacted because of the reckless extravagance of your administration and your utter disregard of the necessities of the American people. And I want, as one citizen of America, to file my protest against the reenactment of this law. We are patriotic. No man can wrest away the patriotism of the men on this side of the House, and, least of all, can it be done by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL]. We resent the imputation of unpatriotic action on this side. We speak for the best thought of the American people. We speak in the name of economy, of decency, of good government, of honest expenditure of the public money, and we protest against the reckless extravagance of the Democratic Party and against the reenactment of this iniquitous law. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I left?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 18 minutes remaining.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have a number of nonpartisan and important letters protesting against the extension for another year of this so-called war tax, one, in particular, a protest against the continuation of the stamp tax on conveyances in connection with mortgages which have become necessary in western Washington largely on account of the workings of the Underwood Tariff Act. Another man writes a protest against the unjust discrimination of this act against jobbers and wholesalers in fruits, vegetables, and other farm products, which, roughly speaking, is five to ten times as much as the corporation income tax.

This letter says:

Hon. ALBERT JOHNSON, Member of Congress.

DEAR SIR: Press dispatches indicate that the present administration will endeavor to have the so-called war tax, which expires by limitation December 31, reenacted for an indefinite period.

We desire to call your attention to the unjust discrimination of this act to jobbers and wholesalers of fruits, vegetables, and other farm products. The tax is so burdensome that it makes it class legislation as applied to these lines of business. Roughly speaking, it is from five to ten times as much as the corporation income tax. Some of the signers of this letter are paying \$50 and upward per month under this stamp tax. This is equal to ten times a 1 per cent tax on a net profit of \$5,000 per year, or 5 per cent on a net profit of \$10,000.

We are taxed under the income-tax law on our net profits; we are further taxed under the corporation-tax law on our net profits; and now we are unduly taxed under the stamp act of the so-called war tax.

We hope you will use all the force at your command to secure such amendments to the so-called war tax as will relieve us of some of this triple burden.

It seems to us there should be a limit somewhere to the continual taxation of brains and industry.

Yours, very respectfully,

E. S. GILL, Secretary.

Not only does this war-tax extension which is being shoved over to-day continue a tax which catches the small shipments of produce, but it is actually proposed, when the act is revamped after the holiday, to increase that tax to 3 cents from 1 cent. I have a letter from W. H. Paulhamus, president of the Puyallup and Sumner Fruit Grovers' Association, as follows:

Hon. ALBERT JOHNSON, Member of Congress.

Mr. DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Permit me to call your attention to the fact that Congress will undoubtedly be taking up the matter of obtaining revenue to cover Government expenses, and it is my understanding that an effort will be made to increase the revenue stamps of 1 cent now required on bills of lading to 3 cents. This will be an extreme hardship on jobbers, wholesalers, grocers, brokers, and manufacturers in this State, who are very extensive users of bills of lading, and to increase the Government revenue 200 per cent will be rather heavy. I trust that we will have your assistance in giving this matter serious consideration.

With kind personal regards,

W. H. PAULHAMUS, President.

I am glad of the opportunity to present these, even if given very brief time, and I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The man who complains about the excess of stamps on conveyances, which have resulted from shingle mill, lumber mill, and other failures, also complains of the tax on other legal papers which have been necessary by the hardships the low tariff act of Mr. UNDERWOOD have imposed upon our great Northwest. He concludes his letter with the sentence:

It may be necessary that the stamp tax be reenacted to prevent a national deficit but the burdens of the present administration are certainly a sufficient handicap on business up to date.

He says further:

The issuance of stock certificates under the laws of this State does not represent any business done whatever. It merely represents the change of the property owned by persons into corporation form, and is not in any sense a tax on business because no business is done. If it were a tax on the sales of stock in which money was received it would be far less objectionable because some benefit would be received. But, as you know, under the laws of this State, the stock is issued usually in consideration of the turning over of the business or the plant which is thus given corporate form merely, or the stock is issued to the persons who subscribe out of the payment of any money or the turning over of the property, and does not in any sense represent any business actually done. Namely, to illustrate:

In Mr. Hyde's case he turns over his patents to the corporation in order to do business as a corporation. No real sale is made; the value is largely speculative and is the amount of business energy that is put into the business in the future that will make it succeed. The tax on the stock to be issued for the patent, merely makes a wet blanket on the business and on his ability to make the stock of value.

Mr. Chairman, I am told that a lively exchange of words occurred in the Democratic caucus Monday night when the vote to extend this "war" tax was seceded up. One Democrat wanted to know why there was necessity for it. The southern Democrat who was leading the fight for it said that it was a long story—too long to be explained. The inquiring western Democrat insisted on knowing why the "war" tax had to be renewed. "Well, I'll tell you," was the reply. "Mr. UNDERWOOD and his Democratic colleagues on the committee wrote a tariff measure which they thought would raise enough revenue to keep the country going. Mr. UNDERWOOD took their bill to President Wilson. The latter objected. Mr. UNDERWOOD wrote another bill and took it to the White House. That was turned down. Then the President wrote his own ideas into the bill, and the deficit is the result."

That, Mr. Chairman, is one explanation for this ill-considered and ill-balanced measure, which is about to be extended for a year, and which before the year is up will be, so the President has said, made stiffer; or, in other words, more odious and more oppressive.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL].

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, it has always been a mystery to me why the Democratic Party prefers to tax the American people when they want to raise revenue to putting a tax on importations that came into the United States. That mystery has not been solved. There is an opportunity here to-day to impose taxes on importations that would raise revenues to the amount of \$77,000,000 if you simply taxed the importations that are coming in now, as they were taxed under the act of 1909. But you prefer to tax the people of the United States. The man who borrows must pay a tax upon the note he gives. You tax telephone and telegraph messages. You tax everybody in the United States rather than tax the foreigner for the privilege of selling in this market. [Applause on the Republican side.] You are proposing to plaster the people of the United States all over with stamp taxes.

I promised many men in my district, and some of them Democrats, that I would vote at the earliest opportunity to get rid of these stamp taxes, and venture that more than the two Democrats who have admitted it publicly in Washington made the same promise to their constituents.

What are you Democrats going to do to-day? Vote to continue these stamp taxes, contrary to the expectations of your constituents, omitting the opportunity of imposing taxes on foreign producers who are selling in the American market to-day? Goods were sold to the amount of \$56,000,000 more in eight months of 1915 than in a corresponding eight months' period in 1913 under the Payne law. Your revenues have not fallen off because of a falling off of importations, but because of your reduction in the tax imposed upon foreigners for the privilege of selling in this country. [Applause on the Republican side.] But you are just beginning to impose special taxes. If you raise all the money asked to be appropriated by the President in his annual address a few days ago, there will not be room on the American people for stamp taxes. They will be so

thoroughly plastered over that you will have to put one stamp on top of another. You backed up on putting sugar on the free list. Why do you not back up on wool? Why do you not back up on corn, on wheat, on cattle, horses, hogs? Why do you not back up on a dozen other things that are produced by the American people? Why do you not back up on hay, on eggs, on butter, on cheese? You can raise revenue in abundance if you will without imposing taxes on industry, taxes on the people who have to borrow money, taxes on the people every time they turn around. This is not a war tax, because our country is not at war. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SHERLEY). The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I think we are all agreed, so long as we have extravagant appropriations made by a Democratic Congress, that we shall need to raise additional revenue over that now provided for by law. We differ as to the means of raising the revenue. The Democrats are in a majority in the House and in the Senate, and have the Presidency. They believe in raising revenue by applying internal taxes against the people rather than in imposing additional duties upon imports from abroad, which additional duties might in some way give protection to American industries. They have the right to their belief. They have the power to enact it into law.

They passed the present law, which expires on the 31st of this month, somewhat in haste, obtaining votes on the Democratic side of the House by the plea that it was only for a short time, and that while it might contain inconsistencies, while it might contain oppressive features, they would not last long; and having obtained votes on that side of the House by that method, what is now proposed? Well, there is more than one way of skinning a cat. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Instead of coming into the House and proposing to extend even this bad law until it could be revised, they propose to extend it over the next presidential election, and then, if they should by accident be successful, they would make it permanent. If we should win they would be glad to leave a deficit in the Treasury.

Why do you not revise the law? Gentlemen on that side of the House have told constituent after constituent that they never would vote to retain certain unjust features in that law. It is oppressive, unfairly oppressive, upon certain industries of the country. It has ruined more than one manufacturer in the country. It is unfair in many of its provisions, and you would not dare as a new proposition to reenact it as it stands. But, unwilling to be courageous, you propose to do that indirectly which you are not willing to do directly. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I leave it to you to answer to your constituents. There is a large number of people in the United States unjustly and unfairly oppressed by many of the provisions of this act who will remember what you do. The original act did not take effect until after the congressional elections of 1914. You extend this for one year. It will be the last time for many years when you will have any power whatever over any revenue proposition. [Applause on the Republican side.]

You have the responsibility, and those of you who have promised your constituents never to vote for the oppressive features of this law can answer to your constituents. We will call it to their attention. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] is recognized for four minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, in the good old days—in the good old Republican days—Uncle Sam, proud, dignified, prosperous, sat in the place of customs and from the goods and wares offered there in competition with the labor and industry of our country collected goodly sums without burden to our people, which met abundantly the public needs. But to-day Uncle Sam, worried, abashed, apologetic, stands hat in hand, begging pennies at the telephone booths [laughter on the Republican side], levying tribute on little children and sweet girl graduates in the tax on gum. [Laughter.]

Even the chastened joy with which we pay our debts by giving a new note is chilled and dampened by the shadow of the clutching fingers of the Treasury taking its toll of our hard-earned promises to pay. [Laughter.] Whether we buy or sell or borrow, the Democratic administration stands at our shoulders, a beggar of picaresques, while sleek, fat, well-fed publicans in the

form of Democratic tax gatherers take a large toll from the dimes and pennies wrung from a burdened people ere they fling the limited remainder into the yawning vaults of an empty Treasury. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] called on you to perform what he was pleased to call a patriotic and unpopular duty. If he will move to strike out the word "patriotic," I will guarantee him a unanimous agreement to his proposition swelling from the Atlantic to the Pacific. [Applause on the Republican side.]

If this legislation were the only means for the rehabilitation of a bankrupt Treasury, we would join you in passing it; but you all know it is not. You all know that instead of thus burdening our people and leaving the foreigner to bring here his wares untaxed while our factories and mills remain idle, all the funds necessary could be obtained by a slight increase of even a few tariff schedules. Your Treasury deficit is not due to decreased imports, but to reduced duties on the goods we do import. A reasonable duty on wool and the old duty on sugar would alone, on the basis of our imports under the Underwood bill, have brought more into the Treasury than all the receipts from the war-revenue tax.

What we should do is to protect our labor and tax the foreign importer rather than burden labor with taxes and give the foreigner our market untaxed.

If our Democratic friends learned anything by experience or heeded the rising tide of popular dissatisfaction this tax, as unnecessary as it is unpopular, would give way to a measure providing for revenue and protection at the customhouses. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, if I am correct, I have three minutes remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has three minutes remaining.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that my friend from Tennessee [Mr. HULL] should speak so unkindly to me. He said that my statements were saturated with unkindness and ignorance. When I speak truthfully but unkindly to my wife, that is exactly the way she answers me. [Laughter.] However, later on she comes back and apologizes, just as this gentleman will do.

I want to say to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL] and the gentlemen on that side of the House that so far as the measure that is being discussed here to-day, the interest in this bill and other matters pertaining to the tariff are concerned, which the President says will be the only thing we will have to talk about, we will meet you in this Congress, on the floor of this House, and on the platform throughout the country in the coming campaign, and you will fly before us as grasshoppers will squirm and fly before a road roller. [Laughter on the Republican side.] I know what I am talking about when I say that if the manner of bookkeeping practiced in the Treasury statement were to be practiced by a national bank in this country, to show a net balance of money in the bank, a portion of which is there to take care of drafts issued prior to that date, the bank examiner would put every man connected with that kind of bookkeeping in that bank in jail. That is the statement I made, and I have nothing to retract in it. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, in doing my duty to my district and to the country I shall record my vote against this measure. [Applause on the Republican side.]

[Mr. KITCHIN rose and was recognized for one hour, amid applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I am not surprised and I am sure no intelligent man is surprised to see the Republicans in the House to a man oppose this measure. Every dollar collected from the people under this act goes directly from the people into the Federal Treasury and not a dollar goes into the pockets of any favorite of the Republican Party. [Applause on the Democratic side.] In the last 14 years since I have been a member of this House it has been my observation that nothing makes a Republican so mad as when an honest dollar collected from the people goes, where it properly belongs, into the Treasury for the benefit of the Government and of all the people, and nothing makes a Republican so happy as when a dollar collected from the people through a protective tariff goes, not into the Treasury, where it honestly belongs, but into the pockets of the tariff-fattened favorites of the Republican Party. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Of course they are against this bill. My friend from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] says that if any national banker kept his books as the Secretary of the Treasury keeps his as to the financial condition of the Treasury he would be put into the penitentiary. What is the offense of the Secretary of the Treasury? It is that he puts down every

single item of receipts and disbursements, so that every man, woman, and child in this broad land can understand it. In other words, he puts down the truth with candor and clearness, and they want to penalize the Secretary of the Treasury for his candor and his truth. I want to say to my distinguished friend that if it was a penitentiary offense to make—I will not say a deliberately false statement—an absolutely false statement on this floor in regard to the Democratic tariff and the so-called Democratic extravagance not a Republican who has spoken here to-day could be kept out of the penitentiary, if properly prosecuted. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

I am sorry that the Republicans are so sensitive as to take offense at the words of the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL]. Of course he said you are not patriots. Now, between us, whoever said you were patriots except yourselves? [Laughter on the Democratic side.] I think you are patriots from your standpoint. Patriotism is love for and loyalty to one's country. The real difference between you and the gentleman from Tennessee is the meaning of "country." You think just a few little manufacturers in New England and Pennsylvania constitute the whole country, while the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL] thinks that the whole United States, with its hundred million people, constitute the country. [Applause on the Democratic side.] You are loyal and loving and devoted and submissive to that which you think is the country, and so is the gentleman from Tennessee loyal and devoted to what he believes to be the country. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It has been charged in this debate by several Members on that side, and they were but repeating the charges made daily for the last two years by the Republican press throughout the country, that the present administration and the last Democratic Congress were recklessly extravagant; that the Underwood Act was a failure as a revenue producer; that it, together with Democratic extravagance, had caused large deficits in the Treasury; that it had greatly reduced the amount of the general surplus fund; that it had drained the Treasury of its gold. I here and now challenge the truth of every one of these charges and propose to show their absolute falsity in every particular. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I do not pretend to say that the Republicans deliberately make misstatements and misrepresentations on the floor of the House in respect to Democratic legislation, the Democratic tariff, and the so-called Democratic extravagance. But I do say this, that if they are not deliberate and willful you are the most ignorant set of men that ever got together in this world. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] Let me here give you a little illustration of that ignorance. There is not a better or more patriotic or more faithful Representative in this House than my friend from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON], and in his charges against us he is perfectly sincere as he is perfectly ignorant. In his speech a few moments ago he denounced the stamp tax on the poor man's mortgage, which he declared the Democrats put on in the emergency act. He read a petition from his constituents protesting indignantly against the continuation of such a stamp tax on mortgages. The truth is, my friend, that the emergency act expressly exempts mortgages from the stamp tax, and so there is no stamp tax on mortgages. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Let me read to you the act:

Provided, That nothing contained in this paragraph shall be so construed as to impose a tax upon any instrument given to secure a debt, etc.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. For a question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I desire information only. Is a tax placed on notes that accompany mortgages?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; on notes that accompany mortgages and on those that do not accompany mortgages.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Oh, well, what is the difference? Your tariff act and your stamp act have placed great burdens on the far Northwest. We have had collapses of business, many failures, and we are trying to bring the business back, but we find ourselves confronted with a promise of more so-called war taxes. [Applause on the Republican side.] Our people out there are not deceived, and will stand it only until they can make a change.

Mr. KITCHIN. And you can not bring business back because of the stamp tax on mortgages which does not exist. I want my friend from Washington to tell his petitioners that there is no tax on mortgages. I want him to let them know another truth. Let them know that the Republican act of 1898 taxed notes and taxed mortgages, while the Democratic act exempts mortgages. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANN. But we repealed it. [Laughter.]

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; after nearly three years.

Mr. KREIDER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; for a question; but make it short and easy, because I have but an hour.

Mr. KREIDER. The tax on notes is 2 cents for every \$100, is it not?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; we followed the old Republican stamp act in respect to notes.

Mr. KREIDER. What is the tax on a \$500 debt secured by mortgage?

Mr. KITCHIN. Ten cents on the note, whether secured by mortgage or not; but nothing on the mortgage. Having answered the gentleman's question, I wish to proceed.

Gentlemen have charged Wilson's administration and the Democratic Congress with being extravagant. Four Republican speakers, including the leader of the minority, said that the reason that we have deficits in the Treasury is because of the reckless extravagance of the Democratic Party since it has been in power, and the new Republican Members loudly applauded every statement. The old Republican Members remained silent, because they knew how absolutely false it was; that there was not a word of truth in it. Let me make to you new Republican Members a little friendly suggestion, which may be of profit to you. If you are going to applaud every time you hear an untruth or a misrepresentation from an old-time Republican on this floor, you are going to wear out your hands or else you will have to get you some hand pads. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. MANN. We expect to wear out our hands on this side of the House with applause because here is where the enthusiasm is. There is not much enthusiasm over there.

Mr. KITCHIN. What I want you to do is to say something that will make these old Republicans applaud and bruise up their hands a little and not impose all the burden on the new Members. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANN. This side of the House has never acquired the habit of relying upon untruths to gain applause. That pertains to the other side.

Mr. KITCHIN. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am going to show that there is not one word of truth in the charge of Democratic extravagance. I do not believe that a Republican would get up in the House and willfully and knowingly make a false statement. While you gentlemen state on this floor many palpable untruths, I do not attribute it so much to design as I do to the force of habit on your part. [Laughter and applause.]

Now, as to the charge of extravagance. The fact is that, exclusive of the Post Office appropriation—and this is always excluded, because, when we appropriate for the Post Office Department, it comes back in post-office receipts—the Wilson administration and Democratic Congress appropriated for its first year \$17,258,000 less than the last year of the Taft administration and for the last year—this fiscal year—over \$10,000,000 less.

Mr. GILLET. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. GILLET. Who had control of the House the last year of the Taft administration?

Mr. KITCHIN. We had control of the House, we have control of it now, and we will have control of it in the next Congress. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I ask you who had the majority in and control of the Senate? Who had control of the White House? If the Democrats of the House passed a dollar of appropriation that was not right, or not in the interest of the Government and the people, why did not the Republican majority in the Senate defeat it? Who was in the White House? If there was a single dollar of needless appropriation, if there was a wrongful or extravagant dollar in any appropriation passed by the Democratic House, why did not your Republican President, Mr. Taft, veto the bill? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. KITCHIN. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman, or any other, if my time can be extended.

Mr. SLOAN. Yes. This is just one question.

Mr. KITCHIN. All right, just one.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. The gentleman from North Carolina said that I made misstatements about the Democratic Party in this House. I may be wrong; and, if so, I want to be corrected.

Mr. KITCHIN. I am correcting you now. [Laughter.]

Mr. SLOAN. The authority that I have is the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson]. Does the gentleman question that authority?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes. [Laughter.] I want to say here that Republicans have never been able to sustain themselves respectably in any way except by quoting Democrats as authority. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from North Carolina yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. KITCHIN. Let me say this before I yield: Now, gentlemen, you know that I do not object to any Republican or Democrat interrupting me at any time, but I have some important things to say that will, I hope, enlighten the Republicans here, especially the new ones, and unless you are going to extend my time I shall have to ask you all to wait until I get through, and then I will be pleased to answer any question anyone may ask.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman has an hour and I had only 10 minutes.

Mr. KITCHIN. And nobody interrupted the gentleman.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. But the gentleman from North Carolina has referred to some of us by name, incorrectly under the rules.

Mr. KITCHIN. Well, it is almost unparliamentary to refer to the gentleman by name in this House. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] If you have a real good and wise question, it will keep. Now, I will ask the gentleman to take his seat, and when I get through and if he will consent to an extension of time, I will answer every question that he or anyone will ask.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman does not want to have the record quoted?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Very well.

Mr. KITCHIN. I will yield when I get through. Let me return to this alleged Democratic extravagance, the appropriations for which the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET] reminds us were made in a Democratic House. It is true that the Democrats had control of the House. It is equally true that the Republicans had control of the Senate and a Republican President was in the White House. Before proceeding further I wish to remind the House and the country that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET], the minority ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, who now complains of Democratic extravagance, voted for every dollar of the \$1,109,000,000 that that Democratic House appropriated. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GILLET. Oh, I deny that statement.

Mr. KITCHIN. How can the gentleman deny it when his record shows it?

Mr. GILLET. But my record will not show it.

Mr. KITCHIN. Very well; let us see. The gentleman was on the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. GILLET. Yes.

Mr. KITCHIN. And of course if there was anything wrong on that committee he would know about it. He is the ranking member on the committee. He had six Republicans with him, did he not?

Mr. GILLET. Yes.

Mr. KITCHIN. Now, gentlemen, in all fairness, he sat there for months and months—

Mr. GILLET. And 14 Democrats—

Mr. KITCHIN. Helping to frame those bills, and he knew every item in every one of the bills. Members of the House not on the committee have not time to look into all the details of the bills. Now, my friend, if there was a single dollar in those appropriations that ought not to have been expended why did you not file a minority report and come in on this floor and warn the House and the country against it? [Applause on the Democratic side.] But the gentleman did not. He came in and voted for every one of the bills that came from his committee, and if he shows me a single vote on record where he or any other Republican on the Appropriations Committee voted against a single item, then I will vote against this resolution. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. GILLET. If the gentleman will consult the RECORD he will find a great many arguments which I made against the appropriations.

Mr. KITCHIN. Oh, arguments! [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] Arguments! Why, gentlemen, I have heard Republicans argue against this and that, and then go and vote right squarely against their arguments. [Applause on the

Democratic side.] No doubt you did, but I do not recall it, because your arguments will go back to your people for political purposes; but what I am talking about is the vote—your vote.

Mr. GILLET. I have always voted the way I have argued.

Mr. KITCHIN. Then the gentleman did not argue against these bills, because I have looked up the votes of every one of you. There is another thing I desire to ask the gentleman. Did he file a minority report against a single item in the bills?

Mr. GILLET. I do not remember.

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman does not remember. I do—I know. [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.] And he did not. Why, gentlemen, I know more about Republicans—these old Members—than they do themselves, and I am going to teach you young Members something before I get through. [Laughter.] We have other committees that make appropriations. On every committee in this House there are Republican Members. There were seven Republican Members in the last Congress on every committee that made appropriations, and if there was a dishonest, needless, extravagant dollar in any one of the bills reported to the House, it was their duty as Representatives, it was their duty as honest men, to come into this House and file a minority report against it and call attention of the House and country to it; but not a minority report by a Republican against a single dollar recommended by any appropriation committee.

Instead of being more extravagant, we were \$17,258,000 more economical than the Republicans were. But if we were extravagant, you Republicans are estopped from protest or complaint because you approved and voted for such extravagance. Your charge that we appropriated more money under Wilson than you did under Taft, if true, coupled with the fact that you voted for the appropriation under Wilson, is a splendid tribute you pay to the patriotism and integrity and wisdom of Woodrow Wilson and his administration. If more money was appropriated, it was needed when Taft was President as well as when Wilson was President. Did you withhold it from Taft because you did not have the confidence in the patriotism and integrity of the Taft administration? And did you grant it to Wilson because you had such confidence in the patriotism and integrity of his administration that you knew that every dollar put into its hands would be expended for the Government's needs and the public good? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, as to the repeated assertion by Republicans that the Underwood Act is a failure as a revenue producer—why, Uncle Joe, I apologize; it is unparliamentary, but I wish to say that these gentlemen over here on the Republican side have gotten so keen and shrewd that they even fool you about this revenue business and got you to talking about the Underwood Act being a failure. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

To the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY], the ranking Republican Member on our committee; the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN]; the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE]; and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH]; and other Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee, all of whom have declared that the Underwood Act was a failure as a revenue producer, I am going to lay down this proposition, and I will give you and all other Republicans from now until Congress adjourns to refute it.

Instead of the Underwood Act being a revenue-producing failure, the fact is, that from the time it went upon the statute books, October 3, 1913, to August 1, 1914, the date of the breaking out of the European war, the Underwood Act produced \$10,889,000 more than the Payne Act for the same months in the preceding year did. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANN. It is not so.

Mr. KITCHIN. It is not so from a Republican standpoint, but I am talking from the standpoint of truth and facts. [Loud laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] In the last four years every answer a Republican has been able to make against a sound argument and a plain fact is, "Tain't so." [Laughter on the Democratic side.] All right. Let us see if it is not so. The Underwood bill became a law on October 3, 1913. I repeat, from October 3, 1913, to August 1, 1914, the day the European war began, the Underwood Act produced \$10,889,000 more than the Payne Act for the identical months of the preceding year—its last year.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KITCHIN. I will.

Mr. MANN. Are those import duties?

Mr. KITCHIN. Import duties and income tax. [Laughter and cries of "Oh!" on the Republican side.]

Mr. MANN. How candid my friend was to the House! [Laughter.]

Mr. KITCHIN. I said the Underwood Act—not the tariff provision of it, but the whole act, and compared it with the Payne Act, not the tariff provision of it, but the whole act. The Payne Act was not all an import act, was it? You recognized, and it was so stated on the floor by Mr. Payne during the pendency of the Payne bill, that to make up the deficit in customs receipts it was necessary for you to put a corporation tax into that bill, and you did it. [Applause on the Democratic side.] So the Payne Act was not all an import tariff act. It included the corporation tax. This was as much a part of the act as the tariff provision. We declared expressly on this floor during the pendency of the Underwood bill that what we lacked in custom receipts we would make up with the income tax, which is as much a part of the act as the tariff provision of it. We knew, as you know, that the late Senator Dolliver, of Iowa, a loyal, staunch Republican, was right when he said that under the standpat Republican protective tariff for every dollar that went into the Treasury \$5 went into the pockets of the protected manufacturers and monopolists. We resolved that that outrage on the American people and that robbery of them should not be tolerated, and we largely reduced the tariff tax. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We put into the act an income tax which raised \$80,000,000 and every dollar of that went directly into the Treasury for the benefit of the people. To collect that amount under a Republican protective tariff—the Payne Act—the people would have to pay \$480,000,000—\$80,000,000 to the Treasury and \$400,000,000 to the protected interests. I will now give the revenue figures. From October 3, 1913, to August 1, 1914, we collected under the Underwood Act \$306,776,000, while for the same identical month under the Payne Act, the year before—its last year—we collected only \$295,887,000, making a difference in favor of the Underwood Act over the Payne Act, as stated before, of \$10,889,000.

But it may be said—and I think so claimed in the minority report on this bill at the last session—that this is not a fair comparison, for the reason that wool did not go to the free list until December 1 and that woolen goods did not go to a lower rate until January 1, and that, therefore, in those figures I take a part of the revenue under the Payne-Aldrich Act.

Well, let us take the period when the Underwood Act was in full operation. It was in full and unhampered operation from January 1, 1914, to the breaking out of the war in Europe—that is, to August 1, 1914—except as to the little matter of \$2,000,000 from sugar, to which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] is about to allude, as to which the act did not go into effect until March 1, 1914. How did it stand in comparison with the Payne Act, with the corporation tax in it, for the same seven months of the previous year?

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from North Carolina yield to the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FORDNEY. For five months during that time, for the first time in 40 years, our imports exceeded our exports. That was in 1914, in April, May, June, and July. Our imports exceeded our exports for those months. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. KITCHIN. All right; young Members, be careful about applauding that, because he has put himself right into a hole, and will drag you in before you know it. [Laughter.] The gentleman says that for the months of April, May, June, and July, four months, during the first year's operation of the Underwood Act, our imports exceeded our exports. This is true. But he does not tell you, which is equally true, that for the two months of February and March in the first year's operation of the Payne Act the imports exceeded the exports by over \$24,000,000; that the excess of imports over exports for only two months under the Payne Act was over \$4,000,000 more than the excess of imports over exports for the four months of April, May, June, and July under the Underwood Act. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Gentlemen, it is a natural thing for the young Members to applaud a statement like that made by the gentleman from Michigan; but I suggest to you to save your hands until you get the whole truth. [Laughter.] To be more exact, from April, May, June, and July, the four months to which the gentleman refers in the first year of the Underwood Act, there was a balance of trade against us of \$20,500,000, while in the two months, February and March, of the first year of the Payne Act, there was a balance of trade against us of \$24,901,000; and yet he has the audacity to interrupt a gentleman about such a little thing as that when he is trying to enlighten the House, [Laughter.]

All right. Let us return to a comparison of the revenue-producing virtues of the Payne and Underwood Acts. From January 1 to August 1, 1914, the seven months in which the Underwood Act had its full, free operation, unhandicapped by the European war, it produced revenue to the amount of \$233,954,641, while the Payne Act for the same seven months of the preceding year produced only \$215,756,042. The Underwood Act, therefore, produced for the seven months, from January 1, 1914, to August 1, 1914, the beginning of the European war, \$18,198,599 more revenue than the Payne Act did for the same seven months the year previous. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.] Did you catch those figures, Brother Fordney? [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman hereafter will comply with the rules of the House. He is one of the oldest Members of the House and the leader of the majority side of the House, so that at least by his example the young Member will not be led astray. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order.

Mr. MANN. I rise to a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I hope the gentleman will observe the rules.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from North Carolina is constantly referring to Members, out of order, by name; constantly doing it. I did not desire to do anything more than to make a friendly suggestion. If the gentlemen on that side of the House do not know how to be courteous, it would be unfortunate. Except to make a friendly suggestion I would not have mentioned it.

Mr. KITCHIN. I will be courteous. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. It will set to new Members a bad example.

Mr. KITCHIN. I assure the gentleman I would not set a bad example.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will admonish gentlemen that gentlemen must be addressed in the third person. The Chair also wishes to suggest to gentlemen of the committee that it is a breach of order for gentlemen to sit in their seats and interrupt the Member who has the floor. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. KITCHIN. Now, Mr. Chairman, indulge me in just a little apology. If I had thought about it, I would not have violated any rule in that respect. I may have done so, but I was not conscious of it. But I do not see why it should be out of order to address the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Fordney] as "Brother Fordney." [Laughter.] But maybe it is. Another thing, I just felt so sorry for these gentlemen who had made such rash misstatements, and, getting caught, looked so humiliated and penitent, that I naturally addressed them in the affectionate term of "brother" without thinking. [Laughter and applause.]

I wish to impress upon the House some further facts with respect to the revenue during the operation of the Underwood Act before the commencement of the European war. From October 1, 1913, to August 1, 1914, we raised from all sources, including the Underwood Act and internal revenue, \$20,743,893 more than was raised for same period the preceding year from the Payne Act and all other sources. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

From January 1, 1914, to August 1, 1914, when the Underwood Act was in full operation, we raised from all sources \$27,240,127 more than was raised for the same months the preceding year by the Payne Act and all other revenue sources. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That is not all. Comparing same months from October 1 to August 1 of Underwood Act and other sources of revenue with Payne Act and other revenues for 1912, the excess of the Underwood Act period over the Payne Act period is over \$40,000,000. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

In face of these facts I want to ask you seriously this question: Would it be honest or fair or right for any of you Republicans to ever again get up on the floor of this House or elsewhere and talk about the Underwood Act being a failure as a revenue producer? Do not do it any more, gentlemen. You know better now. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

If I can proceed without interruption for a few minutes, I propose to refute the oft-repeated charges by Republicans on this floor and elsewhere that the Underwood Act had caused large deficits in the Treasury. I at once remind the House and the country that August 1, 1914—the date of the outbreak of the European war—under Woodrow Wilson's administration and the Underwood Act, was the first August 1 in five years when the books of the Treasury Department showed an actual surplus of ordinary receipts over ordinary disbursements. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Every single August 1 in the four years of Taft's administration and the Payne Act showed a

deficit. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.] Gentlemen, let us see about these deficits. Just take a pencil, you gentlemen of the minority, and make a note of the truth about deficits! Let us take conditions on August 1. I do not arbitrarily fix that date. The European war fixes that date. Up to August 1, 1914, the Wilson administration and Underwood Act was unhampered by war. Now note: On August 1, 1913, the last year of the Payne Act, there was a deficit of ordinary disbursements over ordinary receipts of \$9,563,000. That is one year. On August 1, 1912, there was a deficit of \$292,000. That is two years. On August 1, 1911, there was a deficit of \$15,524,000. That is three years. Now here comes the first year of the Payne Act, the year with which we can more properly compare ours: On August 1, 1910, the deficit was \$10,055,000. On the first August 1 after Taft was inaugurated as President the deficit amounted to \$14,000,000.

But on the first August 1—1914—after the Underwood Tariff Act had been in force 10 months, under Woodrow Wilson as President, for the first time in five years the deficit was turned into a surplus, and that surplus was \$1,500,000. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Let me also remind the House and the country that, excluding the Civil War period, the three largest deficits in the history of this Government before the outbreak of the European war occurred when Republican tariff bills were on the statute books. Under the McKinley Act, at the close of the fiscal year of 1894, there was a deficit of \$69,000,000. In 1899, under the Dingley Act, there was a deficit of \$89,000,000; and in 1909, again under the Dingley Act, and Taft as President, there was a deficit of \$58,000,000. There never had been another time, except during the Civil War—not even during Taft's administration—until the European war, when a fiscal-year deficit ever reached any of those figures.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. I should like to have the gentleman inform us of the expenditures for the Panama Canal during those years.

Mr. KITCHIN. All right; and I will take 1911 and 1912. The Republican administration issued \$50,000,000 of bonds to help swell the surplus fund and prevent deficits. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. I want to answer your question.

Mr. LENROOT. That is what I want.

Mr. KITCHIN. In 1911 Taft issued \$33,000,000 of Panama Canal bonds, and put that amount into the general surplus. Again in 1912 he issued \$18,000,000 more of canal bonds, and put that into the general surplus.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. FORDNEY. Is it not a fact that over \$300,000,000 had been spent by the Treasury for the Panama Canal and only \$134,000,000 obtained by the sale of bonds, and is it not fair for the gentleman from North Carolina to state that?

Mr. KITCHIN. No; it would not be fair, because it would not be so, for the Taft administration never spent \$300,000,000 on the canal, and you have got the figures wrong. Please sit down one minute. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The Republicans saw that they were going to get into a hole in 1911, and they sold \$33,000,000 of Panama Canal bonds to put that money back in the general surplus fund to swell it, and in 1912, when their campaign was coming on, they issued \$18,000,000 of bonds to add to the general surplus fund. But we Democrats have spent more than \$40,000,000 on the Panama Canal out of current funds, and we have not issued a bond to help out the general surplus fund. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

At this point I will answer, once for all, the Republican persistent charge that Wilson's administration and the Underwood Act had caused the general surplus fund to dwindle away or to be largely reduced.

I make bold this statement, and I challenge you to dispute it. Exclusive of the proceeds of Panama Canal bonds, on the 1st day of August, 1914, after the Underwood bill had had seven months of untrammelled operation, we had a larger surplus fund on hand in the Federal Treasury by over \$15,000,000 than you had on the 1st day of August in any year of the four years of Taft's administration. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.] When the Underwood bill passed on October 3, 1913, up to which time all the revenues had been collected under Republican statutes and all money expended under Republican appropriation acts, we found in the Treasury only \$123,000,000 of the general surplus fund, but under the operations of Woodrow Wilson's administration and the Underwood Tariff Act we in-

creased that surplus until on August 1, 1914, on the breaking out of the European war, we had the magnificent surplus of \$158,384,000, the highest figure that it had reached on any 1st day of August in any of the four preceding Republican years. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.] I want these Republican gentlemen who are continually denouncing—without a shadow of fact on which to base such denunciation—the administration and the Underwood Act for destroying or reducing the general surplus fund to take a pencil and note these facts:

On August 1, 1913, there was a surplus of \$131,454,000.

On August 1, 1912, less canal bonds, there was a surplus of \$138,485,000.

On August 1, 1911, less canal bonds, there was \$135,054,000.

In 1910, the first year of the Payne-Aldrich Act, the surplus was only \$91,999,000.

But on August 1, 1914, under the Wilson administration and Underwood Tariff Act, the surplus reached the amount of \$158,384,000, or \$66,000,000 more than under the first year of your blessed Payne Act [applause on the Democratic side], and \$20,000,000 more than the best year of the Payne Act and Taft administration. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Do you get that? [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Just a little while.

Mr. FORDNEY. Just to correct a statement.

Mr. KITCHIN. I will yield to any Republican to correct any statement made by a Democrat, if he can, because it would be such an unusual thing—almost a phenomenon. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FORDNEY. A Democratic document shows that the total expenditures to December 14, 1915, on the Panama Canal, some of them under this administration, were \$375,200,000 and the receipts from the sale of bonds were \$134,631,000, so, therefore, I was right in my question a minute ago.

Mr. KITCHIN. I was right in my statement that every dollar received for a canal bond was received under a Republican administration. Wilson's administration never issued any canal bonds to recoup the amount paid out for construction of the canal.

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not deny that. [Applause on the Democratic side.] But there has been but a small amount of money expended under Democratic administration in proportion to the amount that was expended under the Republican administration for the construction of the Panama Canal.

Mr. KITCHIN. I understood the gentleman to say that the Republican or Taft administration, as we were discussing the surplus under Taft's administration, had expended over \$300,000,000 for Panama Canal construction.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman permit me to correct him. I said that over \$300,000,000 had been spent in the construction of the Panama Canal, and that only \$134,000,000 of that money had been obtained by the sale of Panama Canal bonds.

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman is right; but I did not so understand him in his first statement. I thought he referred to the amount paid out by the Taft administration as we were discussing that administration.

Mr. FORDNEY. I beg the gentleman's pardon, but that is not what he said at all.

Mr. KITCHIN. Republicans charge that the Underwood Act drained the Treasury of gold. Let us now ascertain the truth about this.

On August 1, 1910, a year after the Payne Act had passed, the gold surplus (over the \$150,000,000 legal reserve) in the Treasury was \$78,421,000.

On August 1, 1911, another year of the Payne Act, the gold surplus was \$112,780,000.

On August 1, 1912, another year of the Payne Act, it was \$118,747,000.

But on August 1, 1914, under Woodrow Wilson's administration and the Underwood Act, the gold surplus was more than \$130,000,000. [Applause on the Democratic side.] In other words, instead of causing the Treasury to lose gold, Wilson's administration and the Underwood Act in its first year up to August 1 put \$52,000,000 more gold into the Federal Treasury for the people of the United States than was there at the same time the first year of the Payne Act and \$18,000,000 more than was there on August 1 of the best year of the Taft administration. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. As I understand it, the gentleman regards the Underwood tariff law as a complete success as a revenue raiser.

Mr. KITCHIN. I do not regard it so—I know it is.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then, why was it necessary to impose an income tax and a war-revenue tax?

Mr. KITCHIN. Why was it necessary for the Republican Party to enact a corporation tax? I will tell you why it was necessary to impose an income tax. It was because we felt and believed, with the late Senator Dolliver, that when you raise revenue by a protective tariff, your method, for every dollar that goes into the Federal Treasury five go into the pockets of the protected interests in and out of your State; but when revenue is raised by an income tax, every dollar collected goes to the Treasury and not a dollar to the special interests. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

In other words, if you raised \$80,000,000—as we did by the income tax—by the gentleman's plan we would have to tax the people \$400,000,000 more, not for the Treasury but for the tariff barons. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

A war or emergency revenue measure such as is now pending was enacted because the European war stopped a large portion of dutiable importations, and we had to raise enough to make it good. But, gentlemen, I do not hesitate to assert—and the assertion is susceptible of the plainest proof—that there would be larger deficits in the Treasury if the Payne Act had been in operation during the European war instead of the Underwood Act. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Was it the European war? Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Oh, Mr. Chairman, I appeal to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] please to get the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] to take his seat and not interrupt me until I get through. [Laughter.] Then I will answer any questions, if I have time.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. No; I can not.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will suspend.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I ask if the gentleman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania after addressing the Chair must not address further remarks to the gentleman from North Carolina until the gentleman from North Carolina has indicated that he is willing to yield, and all Members of the House must observe the rules.

Mr. KITCHIN. I am willing to, but I have not the time.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, when he addresses the Chair—

Mr. KITCHIN. I do decline to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina will suspend. The gentleman from Illinois rises to a question of order.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, when he addresses the Chair, if he desires to know whether some gentleman will yield, must make the inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Let the Chair make this statement: All Members of the House can readily see that when a gentleman addresses the Chair for the purpose of asking whether a Member occupying the floor will yield, it would be a gross discourtesy for the Chair to attempt to interrupt the gentleman occupying the floor in the middle of a sentence; and gentlemen should not persist in repeated attempts to interrupt a gentleman while he is endeavoring to speak. The rules are easy to observe, and the Chair will insist that no gentleman shall persistently address the Chair when it is very apparent that the gentleman occupying the floor does not desire to yield.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. KITCHIN. I hope this will not be taken out of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. No; it will not.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania addressed the Chair and asked if the gentleman from North Carolina would yield. The gentleman from North Carolina has yielded on a number of occasions, and I think he has been very lenient; but that inquiry—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the Chair inquired of the gentleman from North Carolina if he would yield, and the Chair was inclined to think, from the gentleman's actions, that perhaps he was preparing to yield; but the gentleman did nothing that would indicate that he had yielded. The Chair can not attempt to regulate two gentlemen addressing the House at the same time. Members must realize—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I have asked several times—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will suspend. He will not even permit the Chair to speak. Gentlemen must realize

that unless the gentleman occupying the floor will yield that they must, under an observance of the rules, refrain from indulging in audible comment during the remarks of the gentleman who is entitled to speak.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Parliamentary inquiries are not in order while a gentleman has the floor. Does the gentleman from North Carolina yield? The Chair hopes that when the question is answered the gentleman from North Carolina will indicate in some emphatic manner what he proposes to do.

Mr. KITCHIN. I decline to yield, with this explanation and apology. I have only a few minutes more to speak. I yielded to the gentleman three times. I yielded once and he asked a question and I answered it the best I could, though not to his satisfaction. I have something else I desire to say before I close. If I had the time, I would yield to everyone on that side, and the gentleman knows that.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Without asking the gentleman a question, will he permit me to make a statement?

Mr. KITCHIN. Let me get through this point. Let me first show that if the Republican Payne Act were on the books instead of the Underwood Act we would have a much larger deficit and you would have had to raise many millions dollars more by some kind of taxation than we are going to raise under this law.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman refuses to yield, I understand?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; I do decline to yield, and I do it with many regrets and on account of lack of time. Now, I have shown you that in peace times, before the European war, when importations were unobstructed by war, the Underwood Act, with its income tax, raised \$18,000,000 more than the Payne Act, with its corporation tax. If in times of peace the Underwood Act produced more revenue than the Payne Act did, by what process of reason do you conclude that during this war it would produce less than the Payne Act would, which, in addition to the war, would be a further handicap to importations by its prohibitive tax on imports? It has been the opinion and the assertion of Republicans from time out of mind that if we lowered the tariff more importations would come into the country. In fact, when we passed the Underwood Act they made many and loud protests and predictions that a great flood of importations would rush in over the low tariff which would drown all American industries.

Their contention has always been that a low tariff induces increase of importations and that a high tariff, such as the Payne Act, obstructs and prevents large importations. Under the Underwood Act, imposing a low tariff, importations of dutiable goods have largely decreased since the war began; how could you expect more importations and a larger revenue during this almost world-wide war with importations further handicapped by a higher tariff, such as the Payne Act, enacted for the purpose of keeping them out? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

If the Payne Act had been on the statute books during this war, and the same amount of dutiable articles had come in as has been coming in under the lower Underwood Act, which is an impossible assumption from both a Democratic and Republican theory, and if the same articles which were transferred from the dutiable list over to the free list in the Underwood Act were being imported to-day in the same quantities as were imported under the Payne Act in 1913, which is another impossible assumption, the Payne Act would only have raised \$24,000,000 more than the Underwood Act. But if we compare the proportionate difference between importations under the Payne Act and the Underwood Act before the war, and the excess of revenue of the Underwood income tax over the Payne corporation tax and consider the natural and inevitable decrease of importations by reason of the higher tariff rates of the Payne Act, if it were now in operation, it would yield under present conditions at least \$25,000,000 less than the Underwood Act is now producing. There is not a thoughtful man, there is not a student of the revenue subject who, if he will make a thorough investigation, will not be forced to the conclusion that if the Payne Act had been in force during the war we would have to raise many million dollars more than we have to raise now, and that we would have many million dollars more of deficit in the Treasury than we have now.

Mr. Chairman, I have been interrupted so often I trust that the House will indulge me, in conclusion, in a brief recapitulation. Republicans charge:

First. That the Wilson administration and Democratic Congress have been extravagant in appropriations—more extravagant than the Taft administration. There is no truth in this charge.

The fact is that exclusive of the Post Office appropriation bill, for which every Republican in the House voted, for the first year of the Wilson administration we appropriated \$17,258,000 less than the last year's appropriation acts of the Taft administration, and for the last year—the present fiscal year—we appropriated over \$10,000,000 less than the last year of Taft's administration.

Suppose we had been extravagant, Republicans are estopped from making the charge. Not a protest, not a minority report from a single Republican Member of a single appropriation committee against a single dollar appropriated. The Republicans in Senate and House voted for every one of the appropriation bills.

Second. That the Underwood Act has been a failure as a revenue producer.

There is no truth in this charge.

The fact is that from October 3, 1913, date of passage of this act, to August 1, 1914, date of the outbreak of the European war, the Underwood Act produced \$10,889,070 more than the Payne Act did for the same months the preceding year.

And from January 1, 1914, to August 1, 1914, the period of its free and untrammelled operation, the Underwood Act produced \$18,198,599 more than the Payne Act did in the same months of the preceding year.

From January 1, 1914, to August 1, 1914, from the Underwood Act and other revenue sources there was collected \$27,240,127 more than from the Payne Act and other revenue sources for the same months the preceding year.

The figures of record as to revenue collected are:

From Oct. 1, 1913, to Aug. 1, 1914 (Underwood Act).....	\$308,776,456
From Oct. 1, 1912, to Aug. 1, 1913 (Payne Act).....	295,887,386
Excess of Underwood Act.....	10,889,070
From Jan. 1, 1914, to Aug. 1, 1914 (Underwood Act).....	233,954,641
From Jan. 1, 1913, to Aug. 1, 1913 (Payne Act).....	215,756,042
Excess of Underwood Act.....	18,198,599
<i>Revenue from Underwood Act and all sources.</i>	
From Jan. 1, 1914, to Aug. 1, 1914 (Underwood Act and all sources).....	\$456,798,552
From Jan. 1, 1913, to Aug. 1, 1913 (Payne Act and all sources).....	429,558,425
Excess of Underwood Act and all sources.....	27,240,127

Comparing same months of the Underwood Act and all revenue sources with same months of Payne Act and all revenue sources for 1912 there is an excess of the Underwood Act and all sources over the Payne Act and all sources of over \$40,000,000.

Third. That Wilson's administration and the Underwood Act have caused deficits in the Treasury.

There is no truth in this charge.

The fact is that until the beginning of the European war the Treasury was in a better and stronger condition than at any time under the Taft administration, and that on August 1 of every year under Taft there was a deficit, and that August 1 under Wilson's administration was the first August 1 in five years when there was an actual surplus.

On August 1, 1913, there was a deficit of \$9,563,165.

On August 1, 1912, there was a deficit of \$292,000.

On August 1, 1911, there was a deficit of \$15,534,935.

On August 1, 1910, there was a deficit of \$10,055,338.

On August 1, 1909, there was a deficit of \$14,005,564.

While on August 1, 1914 (at the beginning of the European war) under the Wilson administration and the Underwood Act there was a surplus of \$1,484,685.

Let it be noted that on August 1, 1910, the first year of the Taft administration and the Payne Act, there was a deficit of over \$10,000,000, while the first year under the Wilson administration and the Underwood Act there was a surplus of \$1,484,685.

Fourth. That the Wilson administration and the Underwood Act had largely reduced the general surplus fund.

There is no truth in this charge.

The fact is that on August 1, 1914, under the Wilson administration and the Underwood Act, the amount of the general surplus fund, exclusive of proceeds of canal bonds, was \$20,000,000 more than on any 1st day of August during Taft's entire term.

The figures of record are:

On August 1, 1913, the general balance was \$131,454,000.

On August 1, 1912, the general balance was \$138,485,000.

On August 1, 1911, the general balance was \$135,054,000.

On August 1, 1910, the general balance was \$91,999,000.

On August 1, 1909, the general balance was \$109,570,000.

But on August 1, 1914, under the Wilson administration and the Underwood Act, there was a balance of \$158,384,000, \$20,000,000 more than the best year of the Taft administration.

There was on the 1st day of the first August under the Wilson administration and the Underwood Act an excess over the 1st day of the first August under the Taft administration and the Payne Act of \$66,385,000.

Fifth. That the Wilson administration and the Underwood Act drained the Treasury of its gold.

There is no truth in this charge.

The fact is that on August 1, 1914, under Wilson's administration and the Underwood Act, the gold balances in the Treasury, exclusive of the \$150,000,000 gold reserve redemption fund, was over \$10,000,000 more than on August 1 of any year of the Taft term.

The gold balances, according to the figures of record, in the Treasury, exclusive of the \$150,000,000 reserve for redemption of the United States notes, were:

On August 1, 1912, \$118,747,660.

On August 1, 1911, \$112,780,235.

On August 1, 1910, \$78,421,383.

While on August 1, 1914, under the Wilson administration and the Underwood Act, the gold balance was \$130,551,354.

It will be noted that while there was an excess of the Wilson administration and the Underwood Act over each of the Taft administration and the Payne Act years the excess of the first year of the Wilson administration and the Underwood Act over the first year of the Taft administration and the Payne Act was \$52,129,971.

Mr. Chairman, it will be conceded by all fair-minded men, Republicans and Democrats alike, that the just and proper way to judge and assess the value and virtue of the Underwood Act is to consider the effect of its operation from its passage on October 3, 1913, or at least from January 1, 1914, to August 1, 1914, the time of the outbreak of the European war, which disturbed and dislocated the revenue conditions of every Government as well as the business and financial conditions throughout the entire world.

Taking this period of its full and free operation, unhampered by war, as I have in my argument to-day, the Democrats assert with confidence that from every standpoint of the Government's interest and the people's good the Underwood Act is far superior to any tariff or revenue bill that the Republican Party has ever put upon the statute books. [Long-continued applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, may I ask unanimous consent to address the committee for 10 minutes on the subject under discussion?

Mr. MANN. May I ask for order, so that we may hear?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON] asks unanimous consent to address the committee for 10 minutes on the subject under discussion. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, who makes the request?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON]. Is there objection to his request to address the committee for 10 minutes on the subject under discussion?

Mr. MANN. I will not object. I wanted to get plenty of time to talk on this side, and that is more than the time that we got.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, I hope you will forgive my lack of modesty in attempting to address the House on an important subject of this kind during the first two weeks of my service in Congress. I intend to vote for the joint resolution [applause on the Democratic side], and I will do this notwithstanding that it contains a number of oppressive provisions which are burdensome to the people. This is an emergency act in the full sense of the word. We deal with an emergency which can not be controlled by the people of the United States. The peoples of Europe would have been glad to exchange their sorrows and afflictions for the burdens imposed by the emergency act. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I do not believe in the sincerity of the Republicans in opposing this measure. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I have not heard a new word from them or a new idea. It was perfectly sickening to listen to those worn-out repetitions of "tariff, tariff, tariff," just as if the whole field of human thought had been exhausted by the idea of the tariff; just as if the entire vocabulary of the human race had been limited to the word "tariff."

They said nothing instructive, nothing definite, nothing that would lead us to better things.

I wish you would realize that the entire system of taxation needs revision. It is not scientific. It does not face things as they are to-day. The Democratic and Republican parties are both at fault in that they fail to comprehend that new times require new methods.

At some future time, with the indulgence of the House, I will explain the position of the radical democracy, of the industrial democracy, of the advanced democracy, the social democracy of the world on the subject of taxation. I believe in an income and in an inheritance tax. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I would make it impossible for incompetent men and unfit men to inherit by the mere accident of birth the power of millions of dollars and the control over millions of people.

I believe in taxing land that is not actually occupied and that is not used. I believe in a tax on land held for speculative purposes.

I make this short talk more to explain my vote than for any other reason. I can do a great deal better than I am doing now. [Laughter.] And I promise the House at some future time to be a great deal better. [Laughter and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order. The Clerk will read the bill.

Mr. AUSTIN rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Tennessee rise?

Mr. AUSTIN. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, of course the committee itself can not give general leave to print. I see a number of gentlemen rising to address the Chair. What is the disposition on that side of the House?

Mr. GARNER. I do not think there could be any objection to a general extension on this particular bill.

Mr. MANN. I hope gentlemen will defer their requests until we get into the House, and then if general leave is not granted they can make their individual requests.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 59) extending the provisions of the act entitled "An act to increase the internal revenue, and for other purposes," approved October 22, 1914, to December 31, 1916.

Resolved, etc., That the provisions of the act entitled "An act to increase the internal revenue, and for other purposes," approved October 22, 1914 (Stat. L., vol. 38, pp. 745-764, inclusive), are continued in full force and effect until and including December 31, 1916.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 1, line 8, after the word "including," by striking out "December 31, 1916," and inserting in lieu thereof "the expiration of three months from and after December 31, 1915."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the "noes" seemed to have it.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 161, noes 193.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 1, line 8, after the word "including," by striking out "December 31, 1916," and inserting in lieu thereof "April 30, 1916."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, this will give four months after Congress reconvenes to consider revenue legislation, and it is the intention, so we are informed, of the Democratic side of the House to consider revenue legislation prior to May 1, in any event, concerning other matters.

Gentlemen of the House can not fail to have noticed that during an entire hour's speech by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN], the leader of his party in the House and the gentleman in charge of the bill to extend a tax measure, he never by inference referred to the propositions upon which the House will vote. Never a word was said about the tax law which it is proposed to extend; no defense of any of the items in it; a speech which met with approval and applause on the other side of the aisle, but which made some of us wonder if the character of the House had changed any for the worse on that side of the House since the last Congress.

Here is a proposition to let this House consider the items in the law and not to hide, as the gentlemen seek to. Not a discussion of the question has been had in the House. The people are entitled to have their items of taxes considered by the legislative body when it is proposed to put burdensome taxes upon them and to have the different questions involved in it as to taxation voted upon by Members of the House. There is no discussion and no thought of ever letting the House itself consider the items in this law, which every day Democratic Members will say are unjust and unfair, and then go home and tell their constituents that they had to vote with the Democratic Party because they had no opportunity for considering the items. I give you the chance. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed Mr. KITCHIN and Mr. MANN to act as tellers.

The committee divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 183, yeas 189.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 1, line 8, after the word "including," strike out "December 31, 1916," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "the expiration of six months from and after December 31, 1915."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LENROOT rose.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin desires to address the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, we all upon this side of the House realize that it is utterly useless to offer any amendment to this bill with any idea of its being adopted. All that we can do is to make a record of our position upon it.

During the general debate the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL] made a very eloquent plea for nonpartisanship in the consideration of this measure; and yet, Mr. Chairman, if it were not for the fact that Members on the Democratic side themselves first made this a partisan question, first took it into a secret Democratic caucus and tied the hands of every Democrat upon that side, with two exceptions; if it had not been for the fact that they have made it a partisan measure, it might have been possible to have adopted some of these amendments, and particularly the one now before the committee.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment proposes to continue this emergency tax law until June 30 next, which will be the end of the present fiscal year. Some argument can be made that that ought to be done, in view of the fact that the obligations for the present fiscal year have already been incurred and that revenue must be provided to meet these obligations. But, Mr. Chairman, I want to impress upon the new Members, upon that side especially, that by voting for this proposition extending this tax law until December 31 of next year they cut themselves off during this session of Congress from considering the revision or amendment of any item that is found in the present law, except as the Committee on Ways and Means may graciously give them the opportunity to consider them.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. Certainly.

Mr. BORLAND. Would not a new revenue measure repeal this law at any time?

Mr. LENROOT. A new revenue measure can repeal the law, provided, and provided only, this same Committee on Ways and Means will give the House an opportunity to consider a new revenue measure. All of us on both sides of the House have had many letters from our constituents asking us and begging us to consider some of the unjust and inequitable items that are now found in this law. By this vote you will say that you do not choose to reconsider those items; and when you write to your constituents, as you have done, that you will give consideration to these things, remember that by the vote you cast here to-night you who vote for the measure deny to your constituents your right, representing them, to reconsider those items, except as the Committee on Ways and Means may graciously give you the opportunity to consider some of them, for under the rules of this House no amendment will be in order to any proposition that the Committee on Ways and Means may bring amending the present law, except upon the particular item that that committee itself selects and chooses shall be considered.

Again, Mr. Chairman, if the Republicans were in power to-day, the most that they would do would be to extend this law until June 30, because if they were in power, instead of extending it until December 31, they would seek to economize in the expenditures of this Government, so that instead of keeping up these very large expenditures, making these very large revenues necessary, they would make the expenditures accord with the income so far as possible, and if the European war necessitated expenditures beyond our income, we would meet that by the issuing of bonds, which would be paid and redeemed out of current revenues as soon as normal conditions returned and the Republicans could put into force a proper tariff law. This would be good business; it would be economy; but that is a question which our friends upon the other side have never given any consideration to, except in their platforms and upon the stump. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. MANN), there were—ayes 167, yeas 182.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 8, after the word "until," strike out "and including December 31, 1916," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "the expiration of the present session of Congress."

Mr. MANN. If this amendment should prevail, it would leave this law in effect until the end of the present session of Congress, whether that occurs next summer or next fall or possibly next winter. Of course if there is any intention whatever on the part of the Democratic side or of the majority of the Ways and Means Committee to revise this tax law, there should be no objection to this amendment. If you intended to do anything with it before the next election, you would do it during the present session of Congress. There will be no other opportunity to change it until the Members of this House have been elected or defeated, and to some of them the latter word will apply, and they had better take warning.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. MANN. I ask for a division. I will not ask for tellers if I get a real square count.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 165, yeas 180.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk resumed and completed the reading of the joint resolution.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise and report the joint resolution to the House, with the recommendation that it do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FITZGERALD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration House joint resolution 59, extending the provisions of the act entitled "An act to increase the internal revenue, and for other purposes," approved October 22, 1914, to December 31, 1916, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with a favorable recommendation.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the previous question on the joint resolution to its final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the joint resolution be recommitted to the Committee on Ways and Means, with instructions to that committee to report the joint resolution back forthwith with the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MANN moves to recommit the joint resolution to the Committee on Ways and Means, with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment: Page 1, line 8, after the word "including," strike out "December 31, 1916," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "April 30, 1916."

Mr. KITCHIN. I demand the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] to recommit.

Mr. MANN. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 197, nays 210, answered "present" 3, not voting 22, as follows:

YEAS—197.

Anderson	Foss	Lafean	Roberts, Nev.
Anthony	Frear	La Follette	Rodenberg
Bacharach	Freeman	Lehlbach	Rogers
Barchfeld	Fuller	Lenroot	Rowe
Beales	Gardner	Lindbergh	Rowland
Britt	Garland	Longworth	Russell, Ohio
Britten	Gillett	Loud	Schall
Browne, Wis.	Glynn	McArthur	Scott, Mich.
Browning	Good	McCracken	Sells
Buchanan, Ill.	Gould	McCulloch	Siegel
Butler	Graham	McFadden	Sinnott
Callaway	Gray, N. J.	McKenzie	Slemp
Campbell	Green, Iowa	McKinley	Sloan
Cannon	Greene, Mass.	McLaughlin	Smith, Idaho
Capstick	Greene, Vt.	Madden	Smith, Mich.
Carter, Mass.	Griest	Magee	Smith, Minn.
Cary	Guernsey	Mann	Snell
Chandler, N. Y.	Hadley	Mapes	Snyder
Charles	Hamilton, Mich.	Martin	Stafford
Chipperfield	Haskell	Matthews	Steenerson
Coleman	Haugen	Meeker	Stephens, Cal.
Cooper, Ohio	Hawley	Miller, Del.	Sterling
Cooper, W. Va.	Hayes	Miller, Minn.	Stiness
Cocq, Wis.	Heaton	Miller, Pa.	Sulloway
Copley	Helgesen	Mondell	Sutherland
Costello	Hernandez	Mooney	Sweet
Crago	Hill	Moore, Pa.	Swift
Cramton	Hilliard	Moores, Ind.	Temple
Curry	Hinds	Morgan, Okla.	Tilson
Dale, Vt.	Hollingsworth	Morin	Timberlake
Dallinger	Hopwood	Moss, W. Va.	Tinkham
Danforth	Howell	Mott	Towner
Darrow	Hull, Iowa	Mudd	Treadway
Davis, Minn.	Humphrey, Wash.	Nelson	Vare
Dempsey	Husted	Nichols, Mich.	Volstead
Denison	Hutchinson	Nolan	Walsh
Dillon	James	North	Ward
Dowell	Johnson, S. Dak.	Norton	Watson
Drukker	Johnson, Wash.	Oakey	Watson, Pa.
Dunn	Kahn	Paige, Mass.	Wheeler
Dyer	Kearns	Parker, N. J.	Williams, T. S.
Edmonds	Keating	Parker, N. Y.	Williams, Ohio
Ellsworth	Kelster	Peters	Wilson, Ill.
Elston	Kelley	Platt	Wingo
Emerson	Kennedy, Iowa	Porter	Wood, Ind.
Esch	Kennedy, R. I.	Powers	Woods, Iowa
Fairchild	Kiess, Pa.	Pratt	Young, N. Dak.
Farr	King	Ramseyer	
Focht	Kinkaid	Reavis	
Fordney	Kreider	Ricketts	

NAYS—210.

Abercrombie	Byrnes, S. C.	Dent	Gard
Adamson	Byrns, Tenn.	Dewalt	Garner
Alken	Caldwell	Dickinson	Garrett
Alexander	Candler, Miss.	Dies	Glass
Allen	Cantrill	Dill	Godwin, N. C.
Almon	Caraway	Dixon	Goodwin, Ark.
Ashbrook	Carew	Doelling	Gordon
Aswell	Carlin	Doollittle	Gray, Ind.
Ayres	Carter, Okla.	Doremus	Gregg
Bailey	Casey	Doughton	Griffin
Barkley	Church	Driscoll	Hamill
Barnhart	Clark, Fla.	Dupre	Hardy
Beakes	Cline	Eagan	Harrison
Bell	Coady	Eagle	Hart
Black	Collier	Edwards	Hastings
Blackmon	Connelly	Estopinal	Hay
Booher	Conry	Evans	Hayden
Borland	Cox	Farley	Heflin
Brown, W. Va.	Crisp	Ferris	Helm
Bruckner	Crosser	Finley	Helvering
Brumbaugh	Cullop	Fitzgerald	Henry
Buchanan, Tex.	Dale, N. Y.	Flood	Hensley
Burgess	Davenport	Flynn	Holland
Burke	Davis, Tex.	Foster	Hood
Burnett	Decker	Gandy	Houston

Howard	McDermott	Randall	Stephens, Tex.
Huddleston	McGillcuddy	Rauch	Stone
Hughes	McLemore	Rayburn	Stout
Hulbert	Maher	Reilly	Sumners
Hull, Tenn.	Mays	Riordan	Taggart
Humphreys, Miss.	Montague	Rouse	Tague
Igoe	Moon	Rubey	Talbott
Jacoway	Morgan, La.	Rucker	Tavener
Johnson, Ky.	Morrison	Russell, Mo.	Taylor, Ark.
Jones	Moss, Ind.	Sabath	Taylor, Colo.
Kettner	Murray	Saunders	Thomas
Key, Ohio	Nicholls, S. C.	Sears	Thompson
Kincheloe	Oglesby	Shackelford	Tillman
Kitchin	Oldfield	Shallenberger	Tribble
Konop	Oliver	Sherley	Van Dyke
Lazaro	Olney	Sherwood	Vinson
Lee	O'Shaunessy	Shouse	Walkers
Leshner	Overmyer	Sissom	Watson, Va.
Lewis	Page, N. C.	Small	Webb
Liebel	Park	Smith, Tex.	Whaley
Linthicum	Parkman	Sparkman	Williams, W. E.
Littlepage	Pou	Stegall	Wilson, Fla.
Lloyd	Price	Stedman	Wilson, La.
Lobeck	Quin	Steele, Iowa	Wise
London	Ragsdale	Steele, Pa.	Young, Tex.
McAndrews	Rainey	Stephens, Miss.	
McClintic	Raker	Stephens, Nebr.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3.

Austin Roberts, Mass. Switzer

NOT VOTING—22.

Adair	Gray, Ala.	Loft	Scully
Bennet	Hamilton, N. Y.	McKellar	Slayden
Fess	Hamlin	Padgett	Smith, N. Y.
Fields	Kent	Phelan	Winslow
Gallagher	Langley	Sanford	
Gallivan	Lieb	Scott, Pa.	

So the motion to recommit was lost.

The following additional pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. ADAIR with Mr. WINSLOW.

Mr. MCKELLAR with Mr. AUSTIN.

On this vote:

Mr. PADGETT with Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts.

Mr. SLAYDEN with Mr. FESS.

Mr. GALLAGHER with Mr. HAMILTON of New York.

Mr. LIEB with Mr. SWITZER.

Mr. HAMLIN with Mr. SANFORD.

Mr. SCULLY with Mr. BENNET.

Mr. SMITH of New York with Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. MANN. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 206, nays 191, answered "present" 6, not voting 29, as follows:

YEAS—206.

Abercrombie	Davenport	Helm	Nicholls, S. C.
Adamson	Davis, Tex.	Helvering	Oglesby
Alken	Decker	Henry	Oldfield
Alexander	Dent	Hensley	Oliver
Almon	Dewalt	Holland	Olney
Ashbrook	Dickinson	Hood	O'Shaunessy
Aswell	Dies	Houston	Overmyer
Ayres	Dill	Howard	Page, N. C.
Bailey	Dixon	Huddleston	Park
Barkley	Doelling	Hughes	Patten
Barnhart	Doollittle	Hulbert	Pou
Beakes	Doremus	Hull, Tenn.	Price
Bell	Doughton	Humphreys, Miss.	Quin
Black	Driscoll	Igoe	Ragsdale
Blackmon	Dupre	Jacoway	Rainey
Booher	Eagan	Johnson, Ky.	Raker
Borland	Eagle	Kettner	Randall
Brown, W. Va.	Edwards	Key, Ohio	Rauch
Bruckner	Estopinal	Kincheloe	Rayburn
Brumbaugh	Evans	Kitchin	Reilly
Buchanan, Tex.	Farley	Konop	Riordan
Burgess	Ferris	Lazaro	Rouse
Burke	Finley	Lee	Rubey
Burnett	Fitzgerald	Leshner	Rucker
	Flood	Lever	Russell, Mo.
	Flynn	Lewis	Saunders
	Foster	Liebel	Sears
	Gandy	Linthicum	Shackelford
	Gard	Littlepage	Shallenberger
	Garner	Lloyd	Sherley
	Garrett	Lobeck	Sherwood
	Glass	London	Shouse
	Godwin, N. C.	McAndrews	Sims
	Goodwin, Ark.	McClintic	Sissom
	Gordon	McDermott	Small
	Gray, Ind.	McGillcuddy	Smith, Tex.
	Gregg	McLemore	Sparkman
	Griffin	Maher	Stegall
	Hamill	Mays	Stedman
	Hardy	Montague	Steele, Iowa
	Harrison	Moon	Steele, Pa.
	Hart	Morgan, La.	Stephens, Miss.
	Hastings	Morrison	Stephens, Nebr.
	Hay	Moss, Ind.	Stephens, Tex.
	Hayden	Murray	Stone
	Hayden	Neely	Stout
	Heflin		

Sumners	Thomas	Walker	Wilson, Fla.
Taggart	Thompson	Watkins	Wilson, La.
Tague	Tillman	Watson, Va.	Wise
Tavener	Tribble	Webb	Young, Tex.
Taylor, Ark.	Van Dyke	Whaley	
Taylor, Colo.	Vinson	Williams, W. E.	

NAYS—191.

Anderson	Focht	King	Reavis
Anthony	Fordney	Kinkaid	Ricketts
Bacharach	Foss	Kreider	Roberts, Nev.
Bachfield	Frear	Lafean	Rodenberg
Bales	Freeman	La Follette	Rogers
Britten	Fuller	Lehibach	Rowe
Brown, Wis.	Gardner	Lenroot	Rowland
Browning	Garland	Lindbergh	Russell, Ohio
Buchanan, Ill.	Gillett	Loud	Schall
Butler	Glynn	McArthur	Scott, Mich.
Callaway	Good	McCracken	Sells
Campbell	Gould	McFadden	Siegel
Cannon	Graham	McKenzie	Sinnott
Capstick	Gray, N. J.	McKinley	Slomp
Carter, Mass.	Green, Iowa	McLaughlin	Sloan
Cary	Greene, Mass.	Madden	Smith, Idaho
Chandler, N. Y.	Greene, Vt.	Magee	Smith, Mich.
Charles	Guernsey	Mann	Smith, Minn.
Chapfield	Hadley	Mapes	Snell
Coleman	Hamilton, Mich.	Martin	Snyder
Cooper, Ohio	Haskell	Matthews	Stafford
Cooper, W. Va.	Hansen	Meeker	Stephens, Cal.
Cooper, Wis.	Hawley	Miller, Del.	Sterling
Copley	Hayes	Miller, Minn.	Stinson
Costello	Heaton	Miller, Pa.	Sulloway
Crago	Helgesen	Mooney	Sweet
Cramton	Hernandez	Moore, Pa.	Swift
Curry	Hill	Moore, Ind.	Temple
Dale, Vt.	Hillard	Morgan, Okla.	Tilson
Dallinger	Hollingsworth	Moss, W. Va.	Timberlake
Danforth	Hopwood	Mott	Tinkham
Darrow	Howell	Mudd	Towner
Davis, Minn.	Hull, Iowa	Nelson	Treadway
Dempsey	Humphrey, Wash.	Nichols, Mich.	Vare
Denison	Husted	Nolan	Volstead
Dillon	Hutchinson	North	Walsh
Dowell	James	Norton	Ward
Drukker	Johnson, S. Dak.	Oakey	Wason
Dunn	Johnson, Wash.	Paige, Mass.	Watson, Pa.
Dyer	Kahn	Parker, N. J.	Wheeler
Edmonds	Kearns	Parker, N. Y.	Williams, T. S.
Ellsworth	Keating	Peters	Williams, Ohio
Elston	Keister	Platt	Wilson, Ill.
Emerson	Kelley	Porter	Wingo
Esch	Kennedy, Iowa	Powers	Wood, Ind.
Fairchild	Kennedy, R. I.	Pratt	Woods, Iowa
Farr	Kless, Pa.	Ramseyer	Young, N. Dak.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—6.

Allen	Roberts, Mass.	Switzer	Talbott
McCulloch	Sabath		

NOT VOTING—29.

Austin	Hamilton, N. Y.	Longworth	Slayden
Adair	Hamlin	McKellar	Smith, N. Y.
Bennet	Hinds	Mondell	Steenerson
Fess	Jones	Padgett	Sutherland
Fields	Kent	Phelan	Winslow
Gallagher	Langley	Sanford	
Gallivan	Lieb	Scott, Pa.	
Gray, Ala.	Loft	Scully	

So the joint resolution was passed.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On the vote:

Mr. PADGETT (for resolution) with Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts (against).

Mr. GALLAGHER (for resolution) with Mr. HAMILTON of New York (against).

Mr. JONES (for resolution) with Mr. STEENERSON (against).

Mr. SMITH of New York (for resolution) with Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania (against).

Mr. SLAYDEN (for resolution) with Mr. FESS (against).

Mr. SCULLY (for resolution) with Mr. BENNET (against).

Mr. HAMLIN (for resolution) with Mr. SANFORD (against).

Mr. LIEB (for resolution) with Mr. SWITZER (against).

Mr. MCKELLAR (for resolution) with Mr. AUSTIN (against).

Mr. SABATH (for resolution) with Mr. MONDELL (against).

Mr. ALLEN (for resolution) with Mr. LONGWORTH (against).

Mr. TALBOTT (for resolution) with Mr. HINDS (against).

Mr. ADAIR (for resolution) with Mr. MCCULLOCH (against).

Mr. GALLIVAN (for resolution) with Mr. WINSLOW (against).

Mr. PHELAN (for resolution) with Mr. SUTHERLAND (against).

Mr. MCCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, did the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. ADAIR, vote?

The SPEAKER. He did not.

Mr. MCCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from Indiana. I voted "nay." I desire to withdraw my vote and answer "present."

The name of Mr. MCCULLOCH was called, and he answered "Present."

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. LONGWORTH, recorded?

The SPEAKER. He is not.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from Ohio. I voted "yea." I desire to withdraw that vote and answer "present."

The name of Mr. ALLEN was called, and he answered "Present."

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman from Wyoming, Mr. MONDELL, recorded?

The SPEAKER. He is not.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I voted "yea." I am paired with the gentleman from Wyoming. I desire to withdraw my vote of "yea" and answer "present."

The name of Mr. SABATH was called, and he answered "Present."

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. ASHBROOK, recorded?

The SPEAKER. He is not recorded.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. ASHBROOK voted on the first roll call. He was standing in the center aisle. I remember it and a number of others heard him.

Mr. BARNHART. I heard him vote.

The SPEAKER. How did he vote?

Mr. ALLEN. He voted "yea."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, on the statement of the gentlemen, I have no objection to Mr. ASHBROOK's vote being recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will record Mr. ASHBROOK as voting "yea."

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be recorded.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall listening when his name was called?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No; I had been called out of the Chamber on important business.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not bring himself within the rule.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. KITCHIN, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks in the RECORD until January 4, 1916.

Mr. SABATH. Does that mean all Members who have spoken, or all Members?

Mr. MANN. All Members.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that all Members may have until January 4, 1916, to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the joint resolution which has just been passed. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MOROS AND NON-CHRISTIAN TRIBES IN PHILIPPINE ISLANDS (H. DOC. NO. 422).

The Speaker laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which, together with the accompanying documents, was referred to the Committee on Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I submit herewith act No. 2403 of the Philippine Commission, entitled "An act making applicable to that part of the Philippine Islands inhabited by Moros or other non-Christian tribes certain acts of the Philippine Legislature."

Among the acts of the legislature extended to that part of the Philippine Islands inhabited by Moros or other non-Christian tribes is act No. 2325, which is amendatory of the Philippine public-land act, and which, under the provisions of section 13 of the act of Congress approved July 1, 1902, may not go into effect or have the force of law until approved by the President and the Congress.

Act No. 2325 was duly approved as required by law, and I recommend that the accompanying act of the Philippine Commission be also approved. I transmit herewith a letter of the Secretary of War which explains the necessity for the enactment of this law.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 16, 1915.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carr, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendment joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

H. J. Res. 60. Joint resolution making appropriation to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolution of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 663. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Citizens' Bridge Co. to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Burlington, Iowa;

H. R. 3638. An act to extend the time for constructing a bridge across the St. Francis River at or near St. Francis, Ark.; and

H. J. Res. 61. Joint resolution authorizing payment of the salaries of officers and employees of Congress for December, 1915.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. HAYDEN, by unanimous consent, was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of William Wooster, H. R. 4895, Sixty-first Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

Mr. RUCKER, by unanimous consent, was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Nathan McDaniel, Sixty-third Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House joint resolution No. 60, with Senate amendment, and consider it in the House as in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, without waiting to hear it read, as it is rather late to-night and we will be in session to-morrow, this question can come up with other things. So I shall object.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I thought as the gentleman wanted to take 12 hours of debate he would not mind taking more time now for business.

Mr. MANN. It is on account of the requests from the Democratic side of the House, where so many gentlemen want to go to the opera house to-night, that I make the objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 19 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Friday, December 17, 1915, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on reexamination of Westport Harbor and Saugatuck River, Conn. (H. Doc. No. 404); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

2. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on reexamination of Hiwassee River, Tenn. (H. Doc. No. 405); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Plattsburg Harbor, on Lake Champlain, for a deep-water connection with the New York State Barge Canal (H. Doc. No. 406); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

4. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Brier Creek, Ga. (H. Doc. No. 407); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

5. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Quincy Bay, Ill., and channel and slough connecting bay with Mississippi River (H. Doc. No. 408); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

6. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Novato Creek, Cal. (H. Doc. No. 409); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

7. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of New York Harbor, N. Y. (H. Doc. No. 410); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

8. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on reexamination of harbor of refuge at Sandy Bay, Cape Anne, Mass. (H. Doc. No.

411); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

9. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Cane River, La., from Grand Ecore to Colfax (H. Doc. No. 412); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

10. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on reexamination of Gull Lake Reservoir, Minn. (H. Doc. No. 413); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

11. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of South Fork of Kentucky River, Ky., with a view to an additional lock and dam (H. Doc. No. 414); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

12. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Port Clinton Harbor, Ohio (H. Doc. No. 415); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

13. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and survey of Leaf and Pascagoula Rivers from the mouth of Bowie Creek to the junction of the Pascagoula and Dog Rivers, Miss. (H. Doc. No. 416); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

14. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary survey of Connecticut River between Hartford, Conn., and Holyoke, Mass. (H. Doc. No. 417); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

15. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Bayou Plaquemine Brule, La., with a view to the extension of the improvement (H. Doc. No. 418); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

16. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Missouri River from Kansas City, Kans., to the northern limits of Florence, Nebr. (H. Doc. No. 419); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

17. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a detailed statement of the refunds of customs duties for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1915; also Treasury decisions, abstracts of the decisions of the Board of the United States General Appraisers, and court decisions cited in the report (H. Doc. No. 420); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

18. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report of the commanding officer of Watertown Arsenal of "tests of iron and steel and other materials for industrial purposes" made at that arsenal during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1915; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

19. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, submitting an urgent estimate of deficiency in the appropriation for printing and binding for the Patent Office, Department of the Interior, fiscal year ending June 30, 1916 (H. Doc. No. 421); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. QUIN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 4954) directing the Secretary of War to reconvey a parcel of land to the Anshe Chesed Congregation, Vicksburg, Miss., reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 10), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1022) granting an increase of pension to Edmond C. Hausel, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH: A bill (H. R. 6023) for the reduction of the rate of postage chargeable on first-class mail matter for

local delivery; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LENROOT: A bill (H. R. 6024) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Ladysmith, Wis.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 6025) to repeal section 5 of an act making appropriation for payment of certain claims in accordance with findings of the Court of Claims reported under the provisions of the acts approved March 3, 1883, and March 3, 1887, and commonly known as the Bowman and the Tucker Acts, and under the provisions of section 151 of the act approved March 3, 1911, commonly known as the Judicial Code, approved March 4, 1915; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6026) appropriating \$1,000,000 for the use of the United States Public Health Service in encouraging rural sanitation, with special reference to the prevention and suppression of malaria and typhoid fever; to the Committee on Appropriations.

* Also, a bill (H. R. 6027) providing for the erection of a joint monument or memorial to Col. John Adam Treutlen, and to mark the settlement of the Salzburger colony at or near Ebenezer Church, in Effingham County, Ga.; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6028) to provide for medical treatment of Confederate veterans in Government hospitals and appropriating \$1,000,000 with which to build and operate a home and hospital for Confederate veterans and their widows at Claxton, Ga.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 6029) for the erection of an addition to the public building at Springfield, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 6030) referring the claim of the State of Rhode Island to the Court of Claims for adjudication; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COLEMAN: A bill (H. R. 6031) for the reduction of the rate of postage chargeable on first-class mail matter for local delivery; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 6032) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Peru, in the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SNYDER: A bill (H. R. 6033) making an appropriation to establish a national park at the Oriskany (N. Y.) battle field; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: A bill (H. R. 6034) to make available a portion of the appropriation for the immigration station at Baltimore, Md., for such counters, booths, screens, railings, seats, bunks, kitchen and laundry equipment, etc., as necessary in connection with said station; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. OVERMYER: A bill (H. R. 6035) for the reduction of the rate of postage chargeable on first-class mail matter for local delivery; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6036) to provide for the payment of a yearly license tax by manufacturers of native wines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 6037) providing for the construction and equipment of a laboratory for research work at Newport, R. I.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. EDMONDS: A bill (H. R. 6038) for the appointment of second lieutenants in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HENRY: A bill (H. R. 6039) to provide capital for agricultural development; to create a standard form of investment based upon farm mortgages; to equalize rates of interest upon farm loans; to furnish a market for United States bonds; to provide a method of applying postal-savings deposits to the promotion of the public welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SNYDER: A bill (H. R. 6040) for the reduction of the rate of postage chargeable on first-class mail matter for local delivery; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 6041) for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Wakefield, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BROWNING: A bill (H. R. 6042) reducing the postage rate on local letters to 1 cent per ounce or fraction thereof; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 6043) to provide for a commission to codify and suggest amendments to the general mining laws; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6044) making an appropriation to enforce the provisions of an act to regulate the sale of viruses, serums, toxins, and analogous products and to regulate interstate traffic in said articles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 6045) for the prevention and eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BURNETT (by request): A bill (H. R. 6046) to further regulate the entrance of Chinese aliens into the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 6047) to further regulate the admission of Chinese persons and persons of Chinese descent; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FOSS: A bill (H. R. 6048) to create a national arbitration tribunal and to define the duties and powers thereof; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 6049) to amend section 86 of an act entitled "An act to regulate the immigration of aliens into the United States," approved February 20, 1907; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FOSS: A bill (H. R. 6050) providing for the erection of a suitable memorial to John Ericsson; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 6051) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Lowville, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: A bill (H. R. 6052) to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 6053) for the reduction of the rate of postage chargeable on first-class mail matter for local delivery; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ROUSE: A bill (H. R. 6054) for the relief of the Kentucky drafted men; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 6055) to create the department of transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: A bill (H. R. 6056) to amend an act entitled "An act to create a legislative assembly in the Territory of Alaska, to confer legislative power thereon, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1912; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 6057) to amend section 14 of the reclamation extension act, approved August 13, 1914; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6058) for the purchase of a site for a public building at Yuma, Ariz.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 6059) to provide for the erection of a public building at Effingham, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 6060) to amend section 914, chapter 18, of the Revised Statutes of the United States of 1878, relating to the judiciary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 6061) to provide for the erection of a lighthouse on Pilar Point, at the entrance to Half Moon Bay, Cal.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6062) to regulate the coming into and the residence within the United States of Chinese, Japanese, Koreans, Tartars, Malays, Afghans, East Indians, Lascars, Hindoos, and other persons of the Mongolian or Asiatic race and persons of Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Tartar, Malayan, Afghan, East Indian, Hindoo, or other Mongolian extraction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6063) providing for the payment of certain claims of the State of California growing out of the Indian wars; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COOPER of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 6064) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Princeton, in the State of West Virginia; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 6065) to provide for Federal aid to good roads, to permit the several States to utilize the superior credit of the United States in raising road construction funds, to aid the States in maintenance of roads, and to create a national highway commission; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 6066) for the enlargement of the Federal building at San Jose, Cal.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6067) to further regulate the immigration of aliens into the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PARK: A bill (H. R. 6068) to establish an agricultural, plant, shrub, fruit and ornamental tree, berry, and vegetable experimental station at or near the city of Colquitt, Miller County, Ga.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6069) to establish a fish-hatchery and fish-culture station in the second congressional district of Georgia or near Albany, Ga.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KALANIANAOLE: A bill (H. R. 6070) to ratify, approve, and confirm an act duly enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii amending the franchise held by the Hawaiian Electric Co. (Ltd.) by extending it to include all of the island of Oahu, Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. BEALES: A bill (H. R. 6071) providing for the protection of Antwerp or homing pigeons when in an interstate flight; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 6072) to amend the act to regulate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOWELL: A bill (H. R. 6073) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for certain lands to the town of Myton, Utah; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6074) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building thereon at Nephi, Utah; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6075) providing for the establishment and maintenance of a Weather Bureau station at Brigham City, Utah; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6076) to provide for an increased annual appropriation for agricultural experiment stations, to be used in researches in home economics, and regulating the expenditure thereof; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 6077) to amend an act entitled "An act granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico," approved February 6, 1907; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6078) for the reimbursement of the legal representatives of James Harvey Dennis for moneys expended by the said James Harvey Dennis for the improvement of the Tennessee River; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6079) for the erection and maintenance of a steam fog whistle on Point Pinos, Cal.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6080) to establish a lighthouse of the first order on Point Pinos, Cal.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6081) to provide for the erection of a monument at the summit of Fremonts Peak, Cal., to commemorate the unfurling of the flag of the United States upon that spot by Gen. Fremont at the outbreak of the War with Mexico; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6082) granting certain lands to the State of California to form a part of California Redwood Park in said State; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6083) to amend the naturalization laws; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6084) to regulate the coming into and the residence within the United States of certain classes of aliens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6085) to limit denomination of silver certificates, United States notes, and Treasury notes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6086) to provide for the establishment of a life-saving station at Half Moon Bay, south of Point Montara and near Montara Reef, Cal.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 6087) to establish public highways or roads along all section lines in the Seneca, Wyandotte, Ottawa, Eastern Shawnee, Peoria, West Miami, and Quapaw Tribes of Indians in the Quapaw Agency, in eastern Oklahoma; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6088) providing for the removal of restrictions from certain lands in the Cherokee Nation, Okla., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: A bill (H. R. 6089) authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of Sea Gate, Coney Island, N. Y., Ambrose Channel, and connecting waters to Gravesend Bay; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. RIORDAN: A bill (H. R. 6090) to amend section 3342 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROWLAND: A bill (H. R. 6091) for the reduction of the rate of postage chargeable on first-class mail matter for local delivery; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BACHARACH: A bill (H. R. 6092) for the acquisition of additional ground and the erection and construction thereon of an addition to the United States post-office building at Atlantic City, N. J.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 6093) to increase the tax on beer and playing cards; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6094) to establish a fish hatchery at Itta-bena, Miss.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SABATH: A bill (H. R. 6095) to create a legislative drafting and reference bureau; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. ESTOPINAL: A bill (H. R. 6096) in reference to a national military park on the Plains of Chalmette, below the city of New Orleans; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 6097) to ratify the compact and agreement between the States of Oregon and Washington regarding concurrent jurisdiction over the waters of the Columbia River and its tributaries in connection with regulating, protecting, and preserving fish; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ABERGROMBIE: A bill (H. R. 6098) for the reduction of the rate of postage chargeable on first-class mail matter for local delivery; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CURRY: A bill (H. R. 6099) to amend section 72 of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENISON: A bill (H. R. 6100) to provide for the erection of a public building at Sparta, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6101) to provide for the erection of a public building at Carbondale, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6102) to provide for the erection of a public building at Herrin, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HOWARD: Resolution (H. Res. 64) authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to make a thorough and searching investigation of the charges against certain banks by the Comptroller of the Currency; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: Resolution (H. Res. 65) providing for an amendment to the rules of the House as to the manner of consideration of bills and resolutions to amend the rules and for the consideration of any bill or resolution introduced in the House or passed by the Senate; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 68) to cede to the State of Maryland temporary jurisdiction over certain lands in the Fort McHenry Military Reservation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAYES: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 69) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PARK: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 70) to refund under certain conditions a portion of the offers in compromise for failure to make the return required under section 38, act of August 5, 1909, said offers in compromise having been covered into the Treasury, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 71) granting permission for the erection of a monument in the Arlington National Cemetery, Va., to the memory and in honor of the members of the various orders of sisters who gave their services as nurses on battle fields, in hospitals, and on floating hospitals during the Civil War; to the Committee on the Library.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 6103) granting a pension to Eliza J. Lee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6104) granting an increase of pension to James Wasson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6105) granting an increase of pension to James A. Stitsworth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6106) granting an increase of pension to Ezra Deeren; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6107) granting an increase of pension to James F. Dakins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6108) granting an increase of pension to John Buettner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 6109) for the relief of Reuben McKroskie; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 6110) granting a pension to Edward A. Andrews; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6111) granting an increase of pension to Helen M. Lind; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6112) granting an increase of pension to Bridget Murray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6113) granting an increase of pension to Nina B. Pugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALMON: A bill (H. R. 6114) granting a pension to William Fuller; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 6115) granting a pension to Solomon Morris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6116) granting a pension to Hannah Powell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6117) granting a pension to Jane Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6118) granting an increase of pension to James R. Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6119) granting an increase of pension to George L. Wells; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6120) granting an increase of pension to John W. Stroup; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6121) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Harman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6122) granting an increase of pension to John Favinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6123) granting an increase of pension to John Rockwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6124) granting an increase of pension to George W. Medick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6125) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Bryant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6126) granting an increase of pension to John W. Warman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ASWELL: A bill (H. R. 6127) for the relief of the estate of Austin C. Banks, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6128) for the relief of the estate of Lewis Willson Smart, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6129) for the relief of the estate of William Thompson, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BLACKMON: A bill (H. R. 6130) to authorize the issue of a patent to certain land in Alabama to William M. Wilson; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 6131) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Hughes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6132) granting an increase of pension to Samantha J. Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6133) granting an increase of pension to Josiah R. Sampson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRITTEN: A bill (H. R. 6134) granting a pension to John W. Barnes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 6135) granting a pension to William J. Grimm; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6136) granting an increase of pension to Pary McNair; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6137) granting an increase of pension to John S. Martin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6138) granting an increase of pension to Joseph A. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6139) for the relief of the heirs of William Elliott; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6140) for the relief of Theodore Copenhaver; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: A bill (H. R. 6141) granting a pension to Mary Walls; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6142) granting a pension to John C. Rowland; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6143) granting an increase of pension to Robert C. Stevenson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6144) granting an increase of pension to Fred Windgoetter; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6145) for the relief of Edward F. McDermott, alias James Williams; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6146) for the relief of Zachary T. Heal; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BURNETT: A bill (H. R. 6147) granting a pension to Luella Kirtland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6148) granting an increase of pension to Mary F. Wilkinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6149) granting an increase of pension to Eron B. Wallace; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6150) granting an increase of pension to Oscar H. Cox; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 6151) granting a pension to Addie R. Kite; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6152) granting an increase of pension to Louis B. Lomax; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6153) granting a pension to Bessie L. Griffith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 6154) granting a pension to Dora Dee Walker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6155) for the relief of William G. Ruddell, administrator of the estate of Reuben R. Turner; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6156) for the relief of the heirs of George W. Croft; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6157) for the relief of the legal representatives of the Beaufort Library Society; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CANTRILL: A bill (H. A. 6158) granting an increase of pension to Milton H. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 6159) granting a pension to Veronica Werner; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6160) for the relief of Paul Wallerstein; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHARLES: A bill (H. R. 6161) granting an increase of pension to Alfred Yauchler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLINE: A bill (H. R. 6162) granting an increase of pension to Hannah A. Price; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6163) granting an increase of pension to Clara Keller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COLEMAN: A bill (H. R. 6164) granting an increase of pension to Eliza R. Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CONRY: A bill (H. R. 6165) granting a pension to Mary Carroll; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 6166) granting an increase of pension to George H. Wheeler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COSTELLO: A bill (H. R. 6167) for the relief of Dominick Taheny and John W. Mortimer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DARROW: A bill (H. R. 6168) granting a pension to Theresa B. Streibig; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 6169) granting a pension to James W. Sullivan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6170) granting a pension to John T. Biggers; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6171) granting an increase of pension to William W. Merriss; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6172) granting an increase of pension to William R. Hendricks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6173) for the relief of Carl Puckett; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 6174) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Linn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6175) for the relief of Hiram B. Calvert; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DRUKKER: A bill (H. R. 6176) granting a pension to William R. Claxton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6177) granting an increase of pension to Anna F. Haase; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. EAGAN: A bill (H. R. 6178) granting a pension to Elizabeth Dippel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6179) granting a pension to Theresa De Villeneuve; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. EDMONDS: A bill (H. R. 6180) for the relief of Lillie B. Randell; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6181) for the relief of Letitia W. Garrison; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 6182) for the relief of the heirs of Samuel Way, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 6183) granting a pension to Eliza Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 6184) granting a pension to Lodeana C. Hodges; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6185) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6186) granting an increase of pension to Caroline Spragg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GLASS: A bill (H. R. 6187) granting a pension to Pyrrhus Williams; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6188) granting a pension to Hiram C. Howard; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GOULD: A bill (H. R. 6189) granting an increase of pension to Alpheus Demond; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: A bill (H. R. 6190) granting a pension to James Daly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6191) to place Rev. John A. Ferry, captain, upon the unlimited retired list of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HASTINGS: A bill (H. R. 6192) to correct the military record of William C. Pearson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 6193) for the relief of J. A. Riddel; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 6194) for the relief of William Wooster; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6195) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment in the claim of James W. Pearce *v. The United States*; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 6196) granting a pension to Gertrude M. Farrar; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6197) granting a pension to Alta M. Comstock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6198) granting a pension to William Trots; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6199) granting an increase of pension to Daniel M. Bryant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6200) granting an increase of pension to William T. Lambert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6201) granting an increase of pension to Henry B. Haines; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6202) granting an increase of pension to Russell B. Tripp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6203) for the relief of Thomas Bingham; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6204) for the relief of Owen Barnes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6205) for the relief of Andrew J. Lawrence; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6206) for the relief of the legal representatives of Parker S. Rouse, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6207) for the relief of Isabel E. Rockwell; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6208) for the relief of William E. Campbell; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6209) for the relief of the heirs of Ellery B. Wilmar; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6210) for the relief of Albert C. Walten-spiel; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6211) for the relief of the widow and the heirs of Samuel A. Bishop; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6212) for the relief of R. S. Thornton; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6213) for the relief of W. F. Durand; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HEATON: A bill (H. R. 6214) granting a pension to Joseph Weiss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6215) granting an increase of pension to John Stack; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: A bill (H. R. 6216) to correct the military record of Ramon Padilla; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6217) for the relief of A. W. Sudduth; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6218) for the relief of Juan Paiz; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6219) for the relief of Juan Ocana; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOWELL: A bill (H. R. 6220) to correct the military record of Thomas Smith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6221) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Burdick; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6222) for the relief of Daniel M. Frost; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6223) for the relief of Margaret Lafferty; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 6224) for the relief of E. D. Judkins; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6225) for the relief of the estate of William H. Moores; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: A bill (H. R. 6226) granting an increase of pension to Mack Rittenberry; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 6227) granting an increase of pension to Lou Emma Newsom; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6228) granting an increase of pension to William House; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 6229) granting a pension to Burnetta K. Brafford; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6230) granting a pension to Christopher C. Hamilton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6231) granting a pension to W. W. Cooper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6232) granting an increase of pension to C. W. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6233) granting an increase of pension to George W. Knizley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6234) granting an increase of pension to Francis Reynolds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6235) granting an increase of pension to Dock J. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6236) granting an increase of pension to Buford P. Moss; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6237) for the relief of the heirs of William Hardman; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6238) for the relief of Franklin Nix; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6239) for the relief of John T. Warden; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6240) for the relief of the heirs of Ruben Settle, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KALANIANA'OLE: A bill (H. R. 6241) to ratify, approve, and confirm an act amending the franchise granted to H. P. Baldwin, R. A. Wadsworth, J. N. S. Williams, D. C. Lindsay, C. D. Lufkin, James L. Coke, and W. T. Robinson, and now held under assignment to Island Electric Co. (Ltd.), by extending it to include the Makawao district, on the island of Maui, Territory of Hawaii, and extending the control of the Public Utilities Commission of the Territory of Hawaii to said franchise and its holder; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. KETTNER: A bill (H. R. 6242) for the relief of Ralph M. Johnson; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6243) for the relief of Richard Prender-gast; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 6244) granting an increase of pension to Alva French; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LENROOT: A bill (H. R. 6245) granting an increase of pension to Jordan J. McCann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LESHER: A bill (H. R. 6246) granting an increase of pension to James R. Mills; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LIEBEL: A bill (H. R. 6247) granting a pension to Alice McDowell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6248) granting a pension to Ann Roueche; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6249) granting a pension to Lucinda W. Hartley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6250) granting a pension to Elizabeth I. Lyons; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6251) granting a pension to Augustus O. Hartel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6252) granting a pension to John J. Donovan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6253) granting a pension to John Dowdy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6254) granting a pension to Eva Kern; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6255) granting a pension to Bridget E. Reid; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6256) granting a pension to Frank L. Prue; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6257) granting a pension to John Salchli; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6258) granting a pension to William F. Volk; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6259) granting an increase of pension to Oscar K. Stinson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6260) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Wetherall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6261) granting an increase of pension to Frank L. Weiss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6262) granting an increase of pension to Charles Bauschard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6263) granting an increase of pension to Lewis R. Montague; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6264) granting an increase of pension to John M. Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6265) for the relief of Anson Martin Hartson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6266) for the relief of John W. Heald; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LITTLEPAGE: A bill (H. R. 6267) to reimburse Tennie A. Anderson, postmaster at Maplewood, Fayette County, W. Va., for money, money orders, and postage stamps stolen; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6268) granting an increase of pension to Robert Daulton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LONGWORTH: A bill (H. R. 6269) granting a pension to Robert J. Walsh; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6270) granting an increase of pension to Caroline M. Carruth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6271) granting an increase of pension to Augustus A. Prugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6272) granting an increase of pension to William M. Harrod; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6273) granting an increase of pension to Lydia Hawkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 6274) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Sigman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6275) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Van Valkenburg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McARTHUR: A bill (H. R. 6276) granting an increase of pension to Freeman H. Bentley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCLINTIC: A bill (H. R. 6277) for the relief of Lucius K. Osterhout; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MCGILLICUDDY: A bill (H. R. 6278) granting an increase of pension to Myra A. Putnam; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MEEKER: A bill (H. R. 6279) granting a pension to Anna M. Kesselring; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MONTAGUE: A bill (H. R. 6280) for the relief of the Richmond, Fredericksburg & Potomac and Richmond & Petersburg Railroad Connection Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOORES of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 6281) granting a pension to Jane Little; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6282) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth G. Mahan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOSS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 6283) granting a pension to Jasper Stoops; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6284) granting a pension to Sarah Wishard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6285) granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. Camp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOSS of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 6286) granting a pension to Elijah Sullivan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6287) granting a pension to Mary A. Chadock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6288) granting an increase of pension to William Satow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6289) granting an increase of pension to William Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6290) granting an increase of pension to Joseph C. Gluck; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 6291) granting an increase of pension to David McMillen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OAKLEY: A bill (H. R. 6292) granting an increase of pension to Mary Adamson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 6293) granting an increase of pension to Sarah M. Haskins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6294) granting an increase of pension to Peter Greene; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6295) granting an increase of pension to Rachel A. Ballou; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6296) granting an increase of pension to Caroline L. H. Chesebro; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6297) granting an increase of pension to Caroline F. Hart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6298) granting an increase of pension to Cornelius Chapman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6299) granting an increase of pension to Ella A. Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6300) granting an increase of pension to Henry Dana; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6301) for the relief of John Healy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6302) for the relief of Frank M. Horton; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6303) for the relief of John McKenzie; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6304) for the relief of William H. Riddensdale; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6305) for the relief of Mary Randall; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6306) for the relief of Belvedere Steele; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6307) for the relief of Iver Boreson; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6308) granting an honorable discharge to Patrick Bolan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 6309) granting a pension to Everett L. Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6310) granting a pension to William P. La Croix; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6311) for the relief of the estate of Mary Davis Denny; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PLATT: A bill (H. R. 6312) granting a pension to Ellen Mulligan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6313) granting a pension to Harriett Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PARKER of New York: A bill (H. R. 6314) granting an increase of pension to James A. Buck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. QUIN: A bill (H. R. 6315) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Ramsey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 6316) for the relief of the Overland Trust & Realty Co.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RAUCH: A bill (H. R. 6317) granting a pension to Mary J. Brophy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6318) granting a pension to Herbert B. Holloway; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6319) granting a pension to Fred G. Reed; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6320) granting a pension to Stephen Murphy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6321) granting an increase of pension to John F. Tweedy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6322) granting an increase of pension to William H. Bent; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6323) granting an increase of pension to Daniel G. Gallion; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6324) granting an increase of pension to Andrew C. Freshour; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6325) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6326) granting an increase of pension to John W. Flook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6327) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin A. Linville; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6328) granting an increase of pension to Martin Schoonover; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6329) granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. O'Neal; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIORDAN: A bill (H. R. 6330) granting a pension to Joseph F. Flynn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6331) granting a pension to Herman E. Jansen; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6332) granting a pension to Michael Grace; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6333) granting a pension to Rusetta M. Gaylord; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6334) granting a pension to John Delaney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6335) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. H. V. Holdsworth; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6336) granting an increase of pension to Matthew J. McKeon; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6337) granting an increase of pension to Michael Curtin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6338) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Houlihan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6339) for the relief of William E. Farrell; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6340) for the relief of Bridget McGrane; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6341) for the relief of Thomas Crowley; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6342) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John Delaney; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6343) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Washington E. Hall, alias John Duffy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 6344) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6345) for the relief of Laban H. Davies; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RODENBERG: A bill (H. R. 6346) for the relief of F. Simons, R. J. Stemm, T. H. White, and others; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RUCKER: A bill (H. R. 6347) granting a pension to Thomas Lamb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6348) granting an increase of pension to George W. Brookover, jr.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6349) granting an increase of pension to Julia Tomlin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6350) for the relief of Nathan McDanel; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 6351) granting a pension to Thomas Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6352) granting a pension to Scott Roberts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ADAMSON: A bill (H. R. 6353) granting a pension to Samantha March; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6354) granting an increase of pension to John J. Lee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6355) granting an increase of pension to Philip Reubel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHOUSE: A bill (H. R. 6356) for the relief of Frank Address; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SINNOTT: A bill (H. R. 6357) granting an increase of pension to Thomas D. Tweedy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 6358) granting a pension to Mary K. Plowman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of New York: A bill (H. R. 6359) granting a pension to Arthur S. Hurlburt; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6360) granting a pension to Alonzo Sidman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas: A bill (H. R. 6361) for the relief of the legal representative of Thomas W. Daugherty; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 6362) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6363) granting a pension to Emma L. Wallace; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 6364) granting an increase of pension to George D. Mayes; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6365) granting an increase of pension to John C. Logue; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6366) granting an increase of pension to John W. Albrey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6367) granting an increase of pension to William H. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6368) for the relief of John McKendry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 6369) granting an increase of pension to Matildia F. Hedrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6370) for the relief of Moses C. Tingley, an Indian allottee; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6371) to cancel allotments made to three members of the Wintu Tribe of Indians on the public domain in California; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. STINESS: A bill (H. R. 6372) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth A. Morris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STONE: A bill (H. R. 6373) granting a pension to Elizabeth Hakes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6374) granting a pension to David Oliver Spencer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6375) granting an increase of pension to George E. Boyer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6376) granting an increase of pension to Levi Durlinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6377) granting an increase of pension to James T. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6378) granting an increase of pension to George W. Marshall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6379) granting an increase of pension to Charles La Fayette Wilson Neff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6380) granting an increase of pension to James H. Pemble; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6381) granting an increase of pension to John W. Rawley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6382) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Kennedy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWEET: A bill (H. R. 6383) granting an increase of pension to William F. Neal; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6384) granting an increase of pension to Edward Boehmler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWIFT: A bill (H. R. 6385) granting a pension to Alexander T. Graham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6386) granting a pension to Humphrey D. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWITZER: A bill (H. R. 6387) granting an increase of pension to William Shaner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TALBOTT: A bill (H. R. 6388) granting a pension to Howard E. Tolson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6389) granting a pension to Julia M. Connolly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6390) granting a pension to Charles B. McConn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6391) granting a pension to Mary E. Conn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6392) granting a pension to Mary A. Caulk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6393) granting an increase of pension to James T. Rider; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6394) granting an increase of pension to Joseph R. Kemp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6395) granting an increase of pension to Charles Copenspire; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6396) granting an increase of pension to Donna M. Blatter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6397) to authorize the President to appoint Col. Rogers Birnie a brigadier general and place him on the retired list; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAVENNER: A bill (H. R. 6398) granting an increase of pension to James Blue; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6399) granting an increase of pension to Lorenzo B. Morey; to the Committee on Invalid Pension.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 6400) granting an increase of pension to Robert W. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6401) granting an increase of pension to Daniel V. Hamilton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VAN DYKE: A bill (H. R. 6402) for the relief of A. E. Kuester; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VARE: A bill (H. R. 6403) granting a pension to Margaret I. Barrett; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6404) granting a pension to John F. Cassidy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6405) for the relief of John A. Henley; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6406) granting the sum of \$480 to Clara Kane, dependent parent, by reason of the death of William A.

Yenser, late civil employee, killed as a result of an accident at Philadelphia Navy Yard; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 6407) granting an honorable discharge to John Prickett; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6408) granting an increase of pension to Eli C. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6409) for the relief of the heirs of James H. Harris, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6410) to carry into effect the finding of the Court of Claims in the case of Amanda E. Macfarlane; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 6411) granting a pension to Josephine Burnett; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6412) for the relief of John M. Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 6413) granting a pension to Eliza A. Beeber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SELLS: Resolution (H. Res. 63) for the relief of the heir of Robert H. Key, late an employee of the House; to the Committee on Accounts.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of the Shamokin (Pa.) Woman's Christian Temperance Union, urging adoption of Hobson amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), petition of the president of the Sparta (Wis.) Woman's Christian Temperance Union, urging adoption of the Hobson prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), memorial of churches of Aberdeen, Miss., urging adoption of the Hobson prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), memorial of Missouri Grange, urging the enactment of a national rural-credits law; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Evidence to accompany the claim of Rachel Thompson for special relief; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of Ohio Stogies Manufacturers' Association, asking the elimination of the classification of quantity on cigars in war tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of the Army and Navy Medal of Honor Legion of the United States of America, favoring the congressional medal of honor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the trustees of the Newark (Ohio) Merchants' Association, indorsing the so-called Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin: Petition of Harold Reyer and others, of Colby, Wis., in favor of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Petitions of sundry citizens of New York, protesting against tax on perfumery and toilet articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of National Lace and Embroidery Co., relative to exemption from war-tax bill of mutual insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Sons of the Revolution of the State of New York, favoring suitable measure of preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Atlantic Deeper Waterways Association, relative to purchase of Chesapeake and Delaware Canal; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petitions of James H. Bryans and Edward C. Reeger, of New York, favoring military preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of New York, protesting against war tax on liquors; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLINE: Papers to accompany House bill 3143, granting an increase of pension to John Hanes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURRY: Petition of the Sacramento Young Men's Christian Association, of Sacramento, Cal., favoring Federal censorship of motion pictures in interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of Fidelity Storage Co., of Washington, favoring an amendment to the antitrust laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of American Chicle Co., of New York, protesting against tax on chewing gum; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EAGAN: Memorial of Sons of the Revolution in favor of preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EDMONDS: Petition of Men's Association of St. Matthew's Methodist Episcopal Church, of Philadelphia, favoring retirement of civil-service employees; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FOSS: Memorial of Glencoe Men's Club, of Glencoe, Ill., favoring adequate national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FLYNN: Memorial of Sons of the Revolution, favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER: Papers to accompany a bill for the relief of Caroline Sprang; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany a bill granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany a bill granting a pension to Lodenna C. Hodges; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of H. M. Jewett and others, of Mazon, Ill., favoring a national prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORDON: Remonstrances of Lorenz Leopold and 1,877 other citizens of Cuyahoga County, Ohio, against any additional increase of special taxes now imposed upon the brewery and liquor industries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: Petition of National Lumber Manufacturers' Association in reference to agreements upon lumber industry; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of William Anthony and others, in favor of the Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the National Foreign Trade Council, in favor of a sound national foreign-trade policy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Federal Sugar Refining Co., in favor of a revenue tax on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition in favor of the repeal of Schedule B of the emergency revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Dort & Brandt, of New York, against restriction of our commerce; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Sons of the Revolution, in favor of preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Federal Sugar Refining Co., against retaining the present duty on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Dry Goods Economist, in favor of the bureau of foreign and domestic commerce of the Commerce Department; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Loose-Wiles Biscuit Co., against repeal of the so-called mixed-flour law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Charles War Hall, in favor of preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CROSSER: Petition of citizens of Cuyahoga County, Ohio, protesting against any additional war-revenue tax on the beer and liquor industries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYES: Memorial of Peace Army of Construction, against preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of board of supervisors of San Luis Obispo County, Cal., asking support for the Oil Industry Association; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Memorial of the Ohio Stogie Manufacturers' Association, against unjust revenue taxes on stogies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Petition of sundry citizens of Harstine, Mason County, Wash., protesting against increase in Army and Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LIEBEL: Papers to accompany bill for pension to Alice McDowell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to John M. Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany application to remove charge of desertion from record of Anson Martin Hartson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Lewis R. Montague; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Oscar K. Stinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill for pension to Charles Banschard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill for pension to John Salehli; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill for pension for Frank L. Prue; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill granting a pension to Thomas Wetherall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHER: Petition of Sons of the Revolution, in favor of preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of fourth assembly district Woman Suffrage Party, in favor of woman suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of Woman Suffrage Party of the sixth assembly district, Brooklyn, N. Y., in favor of woman suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of tenth assembly district Woman Suffrage Party, in favor of woman suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of Army and Navy Medal of Honor Legion of the United States of America, pledging loyalty to the United States Government; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOTT: Petition of residents of Alexandria Bay, N. Y., for discontinuance of war-revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORIN: Petitions of sundry citizens of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring passage of the Stevens standard price bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MURRAY: Petition of Confederate soldiers of Oklahoma, favoring a return of the \$68,000,000 collected from 1863 to 1868, and known as the cotton tax; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. NOLAN: Petition of Julia M. Starling, of San Francisco, Cal., for amendment of subdivision 5, section 1, Article II, of the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORTH: Petitions of members of the Church of the Immaculate Conception, of Clarion, Pa.; St. Charles Catholic Church, at New Bethlehem, Pa.; St. Joseph's Catholic Church, at Lucinda, Pa.; St. Mary's Catholic Church, of Crown, Pa.; and St. Michael's Catholic Church, at Fryburg, Pa., in favor of amending the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Petition of C. Taubert, of Providence, R. I., protesting against taxation as proposed in the President's message; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Purity Baking Co., of Providence, R. I., protesting against the repeal of the mixed-flour law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Stillwater Worsted Co., of Harrisville, R. I., protesting the British embargo on stick logwood; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts: Memorial of Second Lutheran Church, First Swedish Lutheran Church, Sven Lodge No. 55, Order of Vass, and other lodges, all of Gardner, Mass., protesting against exportation of arms by the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. POWERS: A resolution of the Pineville, Ky., Woman's Christian Temperance Union, asking Congress to submit an amendment for national constitutional prohibition to the States at this session of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRATT: Petition of Margaret A. R. Hollenbeck, Angeline D. Goodrich, Mrs. A. D. Bogardus, Eliz. Teeter, Emma Atwater, Cecil G. Tarbell, Fredrica Marshall, L. A. Willis, Cora French, Evelyn Field, and Jane E. Teeter, opposing bills that weaken our day of rest; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a petition of Mildred Lanterman, C. H. Terperling, Clarence Collins, John Sears, C. H. Gupenning, George Armstrong, Ralph Robinson, Clyde Teeter, Ethel Teeter, Andrew Tarbell, Ed. Ozmun, Mary Morgan, Lucy Robinson, Jessie Ozmun, Flora Armstrong, Jennie Austin, Hattie Lauterman, Bessie Seaman, F. J. Allington, George Jewell, William H. Collins, Belle Collins, B. W. Jewell, H. K. Drake, J. B. Atwater, A. C. Hagin, George French, and Mrs. Marcelle, opposing bills to weaken our day of rest; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: Papers to accompany House bill granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Memorial of Commercial Club of Sandpoint, Idaho, favoring an appropriation to construct and maintain a road through Glacier National Park; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SNELL: Protest of E. C. Gray and A. G. Terwilliger, of Heuvelton, N. Y.; George Gardner, Norfolk, N. Y.; Campbell & Kennedy, Potsdam, N. Y.; Daniel Coughlin, Massena, N. Y.; Fred J. Chartrand, William Gilbo, James McGovern, A. L. Webb, A. Kennedy, Hugh J. Martin, Patrick Ware, J. R. Brandy, George H. Wall, John Lavarney, A. F. McConville, W. L. Merritt, Mrs. Rose E. White, W. E. Coppins, and James W. Lynch, of Ogdensburg, N. Y., against the reenactment of the war-tax measure; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Petition of North Star Farmers' Club, of Thief River Falls, Minn., protesting against preparedness for war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TILSON: Petition of New Haven Drug Club, favoring the passage of the Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of New Haven Medical Association, for amendment of the narcotic-drug laws; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania (by request): Petition of the State Camp of Pennsylvania of the Patriotic Order Sons of America, favoring civil-service pensions; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WATKINS: Petition of sundry citizens of Shreveport, La., favoring Federal censorship of motion pictures; to the Committee on Education.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, December 17, 1915.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we thank Thee that the ethics of our national life has its source and the measure of its power in the prayer life of the people. Our standard of values has come from the unchangeable will of God. Thou hast taught us to take in the spiritual as well as the material in counting the riches of life. Day by day we come to Thee that our hearts may be attuned to the divine standard, that we may know the pleasure of the divine will. May we not deceive ourselves. Long ago we have been taught that a good name is to be preferred to great riches and loving favor to silver and gold. So may we be exemplars as well as leaders of the people and receive our guidance from God. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

SOURCES OF REVENUE (S. DOC. NO. 227).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to a resolution of December 16, 1915, certain information relative to the probable revenue to be derived from duties and excise taxes on tea, sugar, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

TRAVEL OF DEPARTMENTAL EMPLOYEES.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement showing in detail the travel of officers and employees from Washington to points outside the District of Columbia during the fiscal year 1915, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

TESTS OF MATANUSKA COAL (S. DOC. NO. 26).

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, on December 10 a letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting the report of the tests of Matanuska coal for use of the ships of the United States was received and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed. It develops that there are a great many illustrations in the report, and in order that they may be printed the Senate must give its consent. I ask unanimous consent that the illustrations be printed with the document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and consent is given.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 59) extending the provisions of the act entitled "An act to increase the internal revenue, and for other purposes," approved October 22, 1914, to December 31, 1916; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

H. J. Res. 59. Joint resolution extending the provisions of the act entitled "An act to increase the internal revenue, and for other purposes," approved October 22, 1914, to December 31, 1916, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. SHEPPARD presented petitions of sundry citizens of Texas, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Con-